Brutum Fulmen:

OR THE

BULL

OF

Pope Pius V.

F. 2. 55

Concerning the

Damnation, Excommunication, and Depoſition

OF

Q. ELIZABETH,

As alſo the

Abſolution of her Subjects from their *Oath of Allegiance*, with a Peremptory Injunction, upon Pain of an *Anathema*, never to obey any of Her Laws or Commands.

BIBL CANT CAL

With ſome *Obſervations* and *Animadverſions* upon it.

By *THOMAS* Barlow Lord Biſhop of *Lincoln.*

Whereunto is Annex'd the Bull of Pope *Paul* the Third, containing the Damnation, Excommunication, &c. of King *Henry* the Eighth.

Come out of her my People, that ye partake not of her Sins and Plagues. Rev. XVIII. 4.

LONDON,
Printed by *S. Roycroft* for *Robert Clavell* at the *Peacock* in St. *Paul's* Church-yard. MDCLXXXI.

JOHN P. GRAY & SON LTD. CAMBRIDGE
6719-1937

~~668:02~~

666,7 : 32

& x-ref., 668,9:32

THE EIPSTLE TO THE READER.

Reader,

Whoever thou art (Proteſtant *or* Papiſt, *Courteous or Cenſorious*) *having made theſe Papers publick, thou haſt a liberty to read, and a right to judge; and that thou maiſt do it impartially*, (*not out of hate or kindneſs to me, but upon a ſerious and juſt Conſideration of the Cauſe*) *I ſhall neither importune thy Favour, nor deprecate* (*when 'tis juſt*)

JOHN A. GRAY & SON LTD. CAMBRIDGE
C7119-1937

thy ſevereſt Cenſure. For, 1. *'Tis truth, I have impartially deſired, and not indiligently ſought; and if (by the bleſſing of God) I have found it,* Magna eſt veritas & prævalebit, *it will prevail, in deſpite of all Enemies and Oppoſition;* φέρει ὡς ἀβλάβητος, nat ſuper, non immerſabilis undis. *Truth we know (eſpecially Divine Truth, which concerns our Souls and their ſalvation) ever had, and, ſo long as there are Devils and wicked Men, will have in this World many Enemies; who will indeavour (what they cannot do) to ſuppreſs it;* premi poteſt veritas, opprimi non poteſt. *They may dipp, and (for ſome time) keep it under water, but they cannot drown it. If theſe Papers contain truth, (as I hope they do) then I am ſure that every Intelligent Reader, and pious lover of Truth, will be its Patron; and (though in this Epiſtle I do not ſollicit him) ready to vindicate it from the Objections of its Adverſaries. But (on the other ſide) if my Reader relate to* Rome, *and be poſſeſs'd with ſtrong deluſion to believe (againſt Reaſon and Divine Revelation) his Catholick Cauſe, the Papal Monarchy and Infallibility, it will be in vain for me, in this Epiſtle, to deſire* (what I believe I (*a*) cannot have) *his Favour. However, he ſhall have my Pity and Prayers,* That God Almighty would be graciouſly pleaſed to open his Eyes, and bleſs him with the Knowledge and Love of the Truth.

(*a*) The reaſon why I cannot expect the favour or aſſent of my Adverſaries, (eſpecially of the Jeſuites) is, becauſe *Maldonate* tells us, That *Luther* and *Calvin* (Arch-Hereticks) are not to be followed, though they ſpeak things conſonant to Scripture —*Cum ſacris literis conſentanea docent, Non Sequendi.* Nay Calviniſts and Lutherans, Even When They Speak Truth, are no more to be hearken'd to, Then To The Devil. *Lutherani & Calviniſtæ à Deo, & Eccleſia tanquam perniciosiſſimi Hæretici declarati, non magis, Etiam Cum Vera Dicunt, Audiendi ſunt, Quam Diabolus.* Maldonat. Comment. in Matth. 16. verſ. 6. p 336. C. Nor is this *Maldonat*'s peculiar Opinion; for the *Cenſor Librorum*, who approves his Commentaries on *Matthew*, tells us, That *Omnia in illis juxta Orthodoxam Apoſtolicæ ac Romanæ Eccleſiæ Doctrinam Summa Cum Eruditione exponi.* Ita Joh. Clavius De villo. Libr. Cenſor.

2. *We*

2. *We know 'tis true, what the great Roman Orator long ſince ſaid*—Humanum eſt errare, labi, decipi, &c. *The wiſeſt men have their miſtakes*; Bernardus non videt Omnia, & quandóque bonus dormitat Homerus. *Since* Adam *fell, the beſt men have their Infirmities, and ſometimes erre, even when they deſire and ſeek Truth. Since the Prophets, our bleſſed Saviour and his Apoſtles, left the world, I know no man Infallible; nor any, ſave the Pope, who (againſt evident Reaſon and the ſenſe of Chriſtendom) pretends to it. For my own part, I do humbly acknowledge my many and great Infirmities; and for theſe Papers*—Hominem pagina noſtra ſapit, *there may be miſtakes and errors in them; yet it is my hope and (not ungrounded) belief, that there are none ſuch as may prove pernicious, or (in the main) dangerous*—Non hic Centauros, non Gorgonas, Harpyaſve invenies. *No ſuch prodigious and pernicious errors, as our Popiſh Adverſaries maintain, & (ſo far as they are able) vindicate: ſuch I mean as their ſtupid* Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation (*contradictory to Natural Reaſon, Divine Revelation, and all our Senſes*) *their Idolatrous Adoration of a piece of Bread, with* Divine (*b*) Worſhip *due to God only*) *their Sacrilegious robbing the Laity of half the Sacrament in the Euchariſt, contrary to our bleſſed Saviour's* expreſs (*c*) Command, *and the practiſe of the Chriſtian* (d) *World* (*even of the Church of* Rome *her ſelf*) *for above a thouſand years* (*as their own great and learned Writers confeſs*) *&c. I ſay, ſuch errors as theſe, I do* (*and have reaſon to*) *believe, the Reader will not find in theſe Papers. Though it be certain and confeſs'd, that every one, even the beſt and moſt*

(b) *Nullus dubitandi Locus, quin Cultus Latriæ qui Vero Deo debetur, ſit huic Sacramento exhibendus.* Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 13. De Euchariſtiâ. cap. 5.

(*c*) Matth. 26. 27. And they obey'd, and did all drink. & Marc. 14. 23.

(*d*) Cardinal *Bona*, De Rebus Liturgicis, l. 2. c. 18. pag. 491. 492. Pariſ. 1672. Lindanus Panopliæ, l. 4. c. 56. p. 342. Colon. 1575.

JOHN P. GRAY & SON LTD. CAMBRIDGE
6719-1937

most learned Writers are fallible; yet so long as they rationally build their Conclusions upon the clear Principles of Nature, Scripture, or Universal Tradition, They may be sure enough, (and so may their Reader too) that they are not actually false, nor what they so write erroneous. However if the Reader find any errors of what nature soever, and can make it appear, that they are indeed errors, I shall not (as I said before) deprecate his severest Censure, but concur with him, and Censure them my self, as much as he; and do hereby promise publickly to retract them, and heartily thank him for the discovery. For in this Case my Reader and I shall both be Gainers, and (in a several way) Conquerors—(e) Vicimus utérque nostrum, palmam Tu refers mei, Ego Erroris; *my Reader has overcome me, by manifesting my mistakes, and I (by his help) have overcome those errors; otherwise, in* Cyprian's *opinion and language,* (f) Non vincimur cum offeruntur nobis meliora, sed instruimur. *He, who by his Adversaries help and concluding Arguments, gains the knowledge of Truth, is (in that good Father's opinion) not conquered, but instructed. But if the Intelligent Reader discover any error in these Papers, and can, and will really make it appear to be so, let him call it what he will, Victory or Instruction, I shall thankfully submit, and both love that truth, and him for the discovery of it.*

3. *I know that this Tract of mine (as every one of the like nature) is already prohibited and damned at* Rome; *for the Rules* (g) *prefix'd to the* Index Librorum Prohibitorum, *contrived by the Authority of the* Trent Council, *declare all* Books of (h) Controversies *between* Catholicks *and* Hereticks (Protestants *and* Papists)

(e) Vid. Hieronym. adversus Luciferianos, in fine. Tom. Operum. 1. p. 230. Col. 2. G.

(f) Cyprian Epist. 71. ad Quintum fratrem, p. 140. in Editione Rigaltij, Paris. 1648.

(g) Extant dictæ Regulæ Indici Tridentino præfixæ, in Calce Concilij Tridentini. Antv. 1633.

(h) *Libri Vulgari Idiomate de Controversiis inter Catholicos & Hæreticos nostri temporis differentes, non passim permittantur, sed de iis idem servetur quod de Bibliis Vulgari Linguâ scriptis Statutum est.* Ibidem Reg. 6.

piſts) *in any Vulgar Tongue, prohibited and damned; neither to be* (i) *had nor read by any Papiſt, under pain of Excommunication, and many other Penalties contained in their Canons, Papal Conſtitutions, and their Expurgatory Indices. So that although our bleſſed Saviour, by his holy* (k) *Spirit, in the Goſpel, Command all (even the Common people, for to thoſe he writes) to* Examin and try all things, to uſe that underſtanding and diſcretion God has given us, to diſtinguiſh truth from error (*for that's evidently the meaning of thoſe words,* πάντα δοκιμάζετε, prove all things, *as* (l) *ſober and learned Papiſts confeſs) and when we have done ſo, then we muſt* hold faſt that which is good. *I ſay, in this Caſe, in the choice of our Religion, wherein the Eternal weal or woe of our Souls is concerned; though Chriſtian prudence require it, and our bleſſed Saviour, (by his Apoſtle) Command, that we* ſhould not believe every Spirit, *but try before we truſt, and diligently examin Things till we be aſſured of truth: yet his pretended Vicar, with an Antichriſtian Pride and Impiety, Contradicts this, and Commands the contrary. He forbids all Examination; Thoſe under his Tyranny (at leaſt the unlearned and Common people) muſt believe as the Church believes; that is, all that he propoſeth, though it be Tranſubſtantiation, or any thing evidently repugnant to their Reaſon and Senſes too. They muſt* (m) renounce their own Reaſon, *and* if he ſay that is white, which they ſee black, they (*n*) are to believe what he ſays, and not their own Senſes. *All means for the People to examin, whether it be truth or error, which the Pope and his Church propoſes, is prohibited, and deny'd them; nor is it only the Books of Proteſtants which write of Religion*

(i) *Legemes, aut habentes, pœnas in Sacris Canonibus, Conſtitutionibus Apoſtolicis, & Indicibus Librorum prohibitorum contentas, incurrere volumus.* Ita Bulla Greg. 15. Data Rom. 30. Decemb. 1622.

(k) 1. Theſſ. 5. 21. & 1. Joh. 4. 1.

(l) *Omnia probate*, i. e. *Per Diſcretionem dijudicate.* Dr. Hen. Holden in Locum.

(m) *Sublato Omni Proprio Judicio, paratus ſemper ſit Animus, ad Obediendum Eccleſiæ.* Vide Exercitia ſpiritualia Ign. Loyolæ. Toloſæ, 1593. p. 172. Reg. 1.

(n) *Si quod Oculis noſtris apparet Album, Eccleſia Nigrum definierit, debemus quod nigrum ſit pronunciare.* Ibid. Reg. 13. p. 176.

67.9.93

ligion, but the Bible and Sacred Scripture too; even the whole Law of God, and the Goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt (in any vulgar Language, which the People can underſtand) come amongſt prohibited Books, and damn'd at Rome; *and the reaſon they give of ſuch prohibition is impious and blaſphemous. For they ſay* (horreſco referens) the reading of the Holy Scripture by the People, in any vulgar Tongue, is more (o) pernicious then profitable, and brings more loſs then benefit to the Reader. *Although this Doctrine be (as I ſaid) impious, and (againſt God and his Holy Word) blaſphemous; yet it is publickly own'd amongſt thoſe* Rules for prohibited Books, contrived by a (p) Deputation (or Committee) of the Trent Fathers, according to the Decree of that Council; *and afterwards approved and confirmed by* Pius *the Fourth*, Sixtus *the Fifth*, *and* Clemens *the Eighth, as* (q) *the Title of the* Trent Index *aſſures us. After them (that we may be ſure they continue their Antichriſtian Tyranny, to prohibit and* damne the Bible *and all Books which make againſt them)* (r) Gregory *the Fifteenth, and* (ſ) Urban *the Eighth do further approve and confirm the Impious Rules and Doctrine afore-mention'd; and both of them expreſly declare, and in the ſame words;*

1. *That it is* known that the Reading prohibited Books, (*the Bible is one of them*) brings (t) great detriment to the Profeſſors of the ſincere Faith. (*Roman Errors and Popery they mean, which they miſcall ſincere Faith*). *And what they ſay, is moſt certain; for there is no Book under Heaven ſo* deſtructive of their Popiſh Superſtition and Idolatry

(o) *Si Sacra Biblia vulgari Lingua, paſſim ſine diſcrimine permittantur, Plus Inde, ob hominum temeritatem, Detrimenti, cum Utilitatis Oriri.* Ita Reg. 4. Indici Tridentino præfixa.

(p) Vid. Præfat. ad Indicem Librorum Prohib. Confectum à Deputatione Synodi Tridentinæ; Author. Præf. erat Franciſc. Forerius Deputationi Secretarius.

(q) Index Libr. Prohib. ex Concil. Trid. præſcripto; Authoritate Pij. 4. primo Editus, poſtea à Sixto. 5. auctus; demum Clement. 8. Juſſu recognitus.

(r) Greg. 15. Bulla data Rom. 30. Decemb. An. 1622. in Calce Indicis Trid. Antv. Ann. 1633.

(ſ) Conſtit. 114. Urbani. 8. dat. Rom. 2. April. 1631.

(t) *Cum Librorum Prohibitorum Lectio, Magno ſincere Fidei cultoribus Detrimento eſſe noſcatur, &c.* Thoſe be their words in both their Bulls.

try (*which they call ſincere Faith*) as the Bible, as it has been truly explain'd and preached by Proteſtants, ſince *Luther*'s time. *Which is evident in this, that ſo many Kingdoms and Provinces, by the help of Scriptures and Knowledge of the Goſpel, have clearly ſeen the Errors of* Rome, *and juſtly abhorring her and them, are come out of* Babylon.

2. All Licences to read any prohibited (*u*) Books, whoſoever gave them, & to whomſoever they were given) they recall, caſſate, and declare null.

3. *Then they Command* (*under ſevereſt* (x) *puniſhments*) that all thoſe who have any prohibited Books, (*the Bible is one, if it be in any Vulgar Tongue*) they are to bring them to the Biſhop or Inquiſitor, and they are preſently to Burn them.

4. *And then they declare*, (y) That no man ſhall have any Licence for the future, to read or have any prohibited Book, (*no Bible or Proteſtant Book concerning Religion, in any Vulgar Tongue*) ſave only from the Congregation of the Sacred Office, (*the ſupream Office of the Inquiſitors*) which ſits every week before the Pope at *Rome*.

By the Premiſſes, I think 'tis certain, that theſe Papers of mine are (*in* Antecceſſum, *and*) *already prohibited and damn'd at* Rome; *and if their Papal Conſtitutions be obligatory and obeyed, not to be read or had by any Papiſt, ſave only ſuch as have a faculty and licence from the Congregation of the* Sacred Office, (*as they call it*) *the Roman Inquiſitors; and we may be ſure, that thoſe watchful Fathers who guard the Capitol,*

(u) *Omnes & ſingulas licentias legendi aut habendi Libros quoſcunque prohibitos, quibuſcunque Perſonis, cujuſcunque gradus, etiamſi per literas Apoſtolicas, à Nobis aut Prædeceſſoribus noſtris conceſſas, revocamus, caſſamus, annullamus.* So both of them declare in the ſame words.

(x) *Qui Libros prohibitos habuerint, eos ad Epiſcopum aut Inquiſitorem, qui illos quantocius Comburere debeat, deferre teneantur.* Ibidem.

(y) *Néque de cætero ſimiles Licentiæ, niſi à Congregatione Sancti Officij, quæ ſingulis hebdomadis coram Nobis habetur, vel ab aliis per Nos, in eadem Congregatione deputandis concedantur.* Urban. 8. dictæ Bullæ. §. 3.

and industriously study to preserve and promote the Papal Greatness and Interest, (on which their own depends) will give licence to none to read such Protestant Writings, save to those, who (for fidelity to their Catholick Cause and Learning) they judge able and willing to Answer and Confute them: That is, None shall have Licence to read such (*to them*) dangerous and damned Books, save such as have (*a*) solemnly Promised, Vow'd and Sworn firmly to believe and constantly to hold and profess to their last breath (and, to the utmost of their Power, indeavour that others, under them do so too) their new Trent-Creed, and so the whole Mass of their Popish Errors and Idolatries contained and commanded in it. *The Case being evidently this; that (if their Papal Constitutions be obligatory and obey'd) none are to read or have these Papers, save such as have promised, vow'd, and sworn never to believe them; as I have little reason to desire or hope for their favour, so (be it known unto them) I do as little fear their Confutation, or (what I am like enough to have) their Calumnies.*

4. *Although I well know (to say nothing of others) that all our English Papists (both in their Words and Writings) do constantly call themselves* Catholicks, *and* Roman Catholicks; *yet they must pardon me, if in these Papers, I neither do, nor justly can call them so:* Papists *I do call them, and (I hope) they will not be offended, or take it ill, that I do so. For* (b) Baronius (*their great Cardinal and Annalist*) *having said,* That the Hereticks (*we know whom he means*) call'd them Papists; *he adds,* That we could not honour them with a more glorious Title then that of Papists, and there-

(a) *Hanc Catholicam fidem, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest, quam in præsenti* Profiteor, *&* veraciter Teneo, *eandémque* Integram, *usque ad* extremum vitæ spiritum, constantissimè *retinere, &* confiteri, *& a meis subditis, vel illis quorum cura ad me spectat, Teneri, &* Tradicari, *quantum in me erit, curaturum. Ego idem N. Spondeo, Voveo, ac Juro.* Ita in Bulla Pij Papæ 4. super forma Juramenti Professionis fidei, in Concil. Trident. Sess. 24. De Refor. c. 12. p. 452. Editionis Anverp. 1633.

(b) *Recentiores Hæretici Catholicos homines Papistas vocant; & certe nullo sublimiore Gloriæ Titulo Exornare potuissent. Sint ideo nobis viventibus, hæc semper Præconia Laudum, & post mortem, Tituli Sepulchrales, ut sic Semper Dicamur Papistæ.* Baronius Notat. ad Martyrologium Rom. Oct. 16. B. p. 707. Col. Agrip. 1610.

therefore he deſires that they may have the honour of that Title while they live, and that (after death) it may be writ upon their Tombs and Sepulchral Monuments. *For my part, ſo long as they believe and profeſs their new* Trent-Creed, *and the Popes* Monarchical Supremacy, *I ſhall (according to the Cardinal's deſire) call them Papiſts, and if it be ſo honourable a Title (as he ſaies it is) let them have it, I ſhall not envy them that honour, but pity their error, who glory in that which is indeed their ſin and ſhame: For the other Title of* Catholick, *which our Adverſaries, (without and againſt reaſon) appropriate to themſelves; we grant, and know, that anciently it was, and (when rightly uſed) is a word of a good ſound & ſignification, when it was applied to perſons, (as a* Catholick Biſhop, *or* Catholick Doctor, *&c.) it ſignified ſuch perſons as were,* 1. In reſpect of their Faith, Orthodox; *who intirely believed and profeſs'd the true Chriſtian Faith, rejecting all pernicious and dangerous errors, and ſo were* no Hereticks. 2. In reſpect of their Charity, *ſuch as were in Communion with the Church of Chriſt, without any uncharitable Separation from it, and ſo no* Schiſmaticks. *Now that our Adverſaries of* Rome *are (as they pretend) ſuch Catholicks, is abſolutely deny'd; not only by Proteſtants, but (except themſelves) by all Chriſtians in the World, and that upon evident and great reaſon; Conſidering,* 1. *Their many and monſtrous* (c) *Errors (contradictory to ſacred Scripture, and the ſenſe and belief of the Chriſtian World for a thouſand years after Chriſt our bleſſed Saviour) which they approve and publickly receive as Articles of their Faith, in their new Creed, the* Trent-Council, *and Roman Catechiſm; Conſidering alſo their many Superſtitions*

(c) Concerning the Errors, Superſtition and Idolatry of the Church of *Rome*, (with which I charge them) I do not here name the Particulars, much leſs the proofs of them. It is not the buſineſs of this Epiſtle. But many of our learned Writers have long ſince effectually done it. Such I mean, as Biſhop *Jewel*, Bp. *Morton*, *Davenant*, *John White*, *Chillingworth* and Dr. *Crakanthorp*, and (to omit many more) lately, my learned Friend Dr. *Stillingfleet* Dean of *Pauls*. The Reader (if he pleaſe) may conſult theſe and find ſatisfaction. Some thing alſo is ſaid to that purpoſe, in the following Papers. But if my Popiſh Adverſaries (who are not eaſily, if at all to be ſatisfy'd) require me particularly to make good my Charge; I ſhall undertake it; and hope (by the bleſſing of God, and the help of the Writings of thoſe learned Perſons I have named) to ſay that which might (though may be it will not) ſatisfie my Adverſaries.

67/19-95

and stupid Idolatry, professed and practised by them in their sacred Offices (their Missal, Breviary, Horæ B. Virginis, *their* Ritual and Pontifical, &c.) *I say, these things impartially considered, they may be (and really are) Idolatrous Hereticks; but 'tis impossible they should be, (what they against greatest evidence pretend to) true Catholicks. 2. Considering the unchristian (indeed Antichristian) Pride and Tyranny of the Pope and his Party, Excommunicating, Cursing and Damning all Christians, save themselves, (without and against that Charity which the Gospel requires) and so Schismatically cutting off from the Body of Christ whole Kingdoms at a Clap (as* Pius *the Fifth does,* (d) *in the following Bull) which are things inconsistent with the Christian Temper and Charity of a true Catholick; I say these things considered, and that the Pope and his Party are really guilty of such uncharitable Actions, dividing and violating the Union of the Church; it evidently follows, that they are so far from being true Catholicks that they are great and formal Schismaticks; And therefore they must pardon me, if in these Papers, I do not call them (what really they are not)* Catholicks; *and for the same Reason, I do not call them* Roman Catholicks. *For, as it is neither reason nor sense to call him an English Gentleman, who is no Gentleman at all; or him a* Sorbon *Doctor, who never saw* Paris, *or ever had or desired that Degree; so it is alike irrational to call him a* Roman Catholick, *who really is an* Erring Schismatick, *and no* Catholick *at all.*

(d) *Declaramus prædictam Elizabetham Hæreticam, eique Adhærentes Anathematis Sententiam incurrisse, esséque à Christi Corporis Unitate Præcisos.* In dictâ Pij. 5. Bullâ. §. 3.

5. *I know some (otherwise learned and pious) Writers, who say that those words* Roman Catholick *are inconsistent, and imply a Contradiction, as signifying a* particular Universal. *But this (I confess) is a manifest mistake.*

ſtake. *For not only* particular Perſons, (*of which before*) *but* particular Churches, *in this or that City* (*be it great or little*) *have anciently and uſually been call'd* Catholick Churches, *without any Contradiction or Impropriety. In an Epiſtle of a* (e) *great Council at* Antioch, *we find the* (f) *Biſhop of that City call'd* a Catholick, *and that particular Church a* (g) Catholick Church. *So in the Subſcriptions to* Nazianzen's *laſt Will and Teſtament*, Optimus *Bp. of* Antioch, *ſubſcribes thus*; Optimus Bp. of the Catholick (*h*) Church at Antioch; *and the reſt of the Biſhops who ſubſcribe that Teſtament*, (*and they are ſix or ſeven*) *uſe the ſame Form. So* Nazianzen *ſubſcribes himſelf* Biſhop of the Catholick Church in Conſtantinople; Amphilochius Biſhop of the Catholick Church in Iconium; *and ſo all the reſt. In the* Appendix *to the* Theodoſian Code, *Pope* Vigilius *begins his Encyclical Epiſtle thus* — Vigilius (*i*) Epiſcopus Eccleſiæ Catholicæ Urbis Romæ: Biſhop of the Catholick Church of the City of Rome. *So Pope* (k) Leo *the Great* (*and* (l) *many more Biſhops of* Rome) *uſes the very ſame form. The Popes ſtiled themſelves* Catholicæ Eccleſiæ (non Orbis, ſed Urbis Romæ Epiſcopos. *The Antichriſtian ſtile of* Univerſal Biſhop, (*as Pope* (m) Gregory *the Great calls it*) *was not yet uſurped at* Rome. *The Biſhops of* Rome *then, and their Church, were* Catholick, *and ſo was every Orthodox Biſhop and his Church, as well and as much as they.* Conſtantinople, Iconium, Antioch, *&c. and their Biſhops, were as truly* Catholick *as St.* Peter's *Succeſſor, or* Rome *it ſelf: The truth is evidently this*; *the Pope and his Party are in this*, nec Chriſti, nec Petri, ſed Donati Succeſſores; *they do not follow* Peter *or our bleſſed*

(e) *Synodus innumerabilium fere Epiſcoporum* (as *Valeſius* renders it) apud Euſeb. Hiſt. l. 7. c. 29. pag. 278. D.

(f) Φρόνιμα καθολικὴν ἔχοντα, *homo profeſſionis Catholicæ.* Even *Paulus Samoſatenus*, till he was diſcovered to be an Heretick, was call'd a Catholick. Ibid. c. 30. p. 282. B.

(g) Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας Ἐπίσκοπος, ſpeaking of the Church of *Antioch.* Euſeb. Ibid. p. 282. 6.

(h) Ὄπημος Ἐπίσκοπος τῆς κατὰ Ἀντιόχειαν Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας: Teſtam. Nazian. cum Invert. contra Julian. Græce. Etonæ 1610. p. 126. & apud Leunclavium, Juris Græco-Rom. Tom. 2. p. 203. vide Epiphan. Edit. D. Petav. Pariſ. 1622. Tom. 2. p. 2.

(*i*) Vid. App. Cod. Theod. per Sirmondū. p. 218.

(*k*) Leo Papa Eccleſiæ Catholicæ Urbis Romæ. Conc. Chalcedon. part. 1. num. 10. 12. & Act. 8.

(*l*) The Reader may have a very large Catalogue of ſuch Subſcriptions, by *John Launoy*. Epiſt. part. 1. In Epiſt. ad Franc ſ. Bonum.

(*m*) Pope *Gregory* damns that proud Title twelve ſeveral times; the places are particularly cited by *Joh. Launoy* (and he no Lutheran) in the Epiſt. *ad Bonum* before-nam'd.

bleſſed Saviour, (*as they vainly bragg*) *but that impious Heretick* Donatus, *whoſe damnable Schiſm and Hereſie they have eſpouſed. St.* Auguſtin (*who well knew it*) *tells us, in* (n) *ſeveral places*, That the Donatiſts aſſumed to themſelves the Name of Catholick, ſaid that their Sect was the only true Church, and ſo damn'd all other Chriſtians; and upon this Heretical Opinion, they Schiſmatically ſeparated from the whole Catholick Church. *The Pope and his Party* (*with as little reaſon and charity*) *do the very ſame thing; they* (*as the* Donatiſts *anciently*) *Heretically affirm*, That they, and they only, are truly Catholicks, and the only Members of the true Chriſtian and Catholick Church: and then Schiſmatically Seperate from, Excommunicate and Damn all other Chriſtians.

(n) Vide Auguſtinum Breviculi Collat. cum Donatiſtis, Collat. 3. Dei. Tom. 7. p. 568. Edit. Baſil. 1569. & Epiſt. 67. ad Alipium. Tom. 2. p. 323.

6. *And further* (*that I may freely ſpeak, what I really believe*) *I am ſo far from believing* the Pope and his Party *to be* (*what they vainly pretend*) *the only true Chriſtian and Catholick Church; that I do believe them* (*and ſo did thouſands before* Luther, *and many whole Kingdoms and Provinces ſince*) *to be* Eccleſia Malignantium *an Antichriſtian Sect and Synagogue* (in fide) *highly erroneous, and* (in facto) *as highly impious. And the Pope ſo far from being* Peter's *Succeſſor, and our B. Saviour's Vicar-General, that he is* (o) that man of Sin, ὁ Ἀντικείμενος, That Adverſary *of our bleſſed Saviour, and the great Antichriſt, the Apoſtle ſpeaks of*, who Exalts himſelf (ὑπὲρ πάντα λεγόμενον Θεὸν, ἢ σέβασμα) above all Kings and Emperors. *This* (*I hope*) *will in part appear by what is ſaid in the following Papers. At preſent, I ſhall deſire the Impartial Reader* (*who poſſibly may*

(o) 2 Theſſ. 2. 3. 4. See Biſhop *Jewel* on this Chapter, and this fourth Verſe. Sir *Chriſtoph. Sibthorp's* Advertiſement to the Catholicks in *Ireland.* Dublin 1622. part. 3. c. 2. p. 280. 281. 282. &c. Andr. Rivet. contra Silveſtrum Petraſanctam c. 28. p. 537. 538. &c. vid. Georg. Dounamum, Diatr. de Antichriſto, l. 3. & 4. Lond. 1620.

may read this ſhort Epiſtle, and trouble himſelf no further, to read what follows) to conſider, That the Pope really and profeſſedly does Exalt himſelf above all Kings and Emperors, and ſo has this Mark of the Beaſt, and Indelible Character of Antichriſt. *That he does ſo Exalt himſelf, will evidently appear, thus,*

1. *Pope* Innocent *the Third tells the* (p) *Emperor of* Conſtantinople (*and with prodigious Error and Impudence, indeavours to prove it out of* (q) *Scripture*) That the (r) Pope is as much greater Then the Emperor, as The Sun is greater Then the Moon. *So* Innocent *the third*; *and* (*that we may be ſure his Succeſſors liked it well*) Gregory *the Ninth approves, and refers it into the Body of* Canon-Law: *And* (ſ) Greg. *the Thirteenth approves it too*; *and* (*with the other* Decretals) *confirms it for Law*; *and 'tis continued in all Editions of that Law, ever ſince. It is then certain and confeſs'd, That the Pope* Exalts himſelf above all that is call'd God, *above all Kings and Emperors*; *and that he is far greater then they: And if you inquire of the Proportion, how much he is greater? I ſay,* 2. *That their approved and received Gloſſes on their Law,* (*with ſome difference of Opinion*) *calculate how many times the Sun is greater then the Moon, and then infer the Pope's Greatneſs above the Emperor. And here*

1. *The Author of the Gloſs,* (Bernardus de Botono *was the man*) *a good Lawyer, but* (*ſure I am*) *no good Aſtronomer, tells us,* (*ignorantly and ridiculouſly*) — That the Sun is greater than the Moon, (and conſequently the Pope greater than the Emperor) (t) Forty ſeaven times. *This is pretty well, but much ſhort of that Magnitude the Pope meant,* (*if*

(p) Vide Cap. Solitæ. 6. Extra de Major. & Obedientia; and the Lemma to that Chap. which is this — *Imperium Sacerdotio ſubjectum, & ei Obedire Tenetur.*

(q) 1 Pet. 2. 13. (which place evidently proves the contrary) Jer. 1. 10. Gen. 1. 16. Joh. 21. 16. Matth. 16. 19.

(r) *Quanta eſt inter Solem & Lunam, tanta inter Pontifices & Reges differentia cognoſcitur.* Dicto Cap. Solitæ. 6.

(ſ) Bulla Romæ data 1580. Juri Can. præfixa.

(t) *Cum igitur terra ſit ſepties major Luna, Sol autem octies major terra: reſtat ergo, ut Pontificalis Dignitas Quadrageſies ſepties ſit major Regali.* Gloſſa verbo. Inter Solem & Lunam. Cap. Solitæ. 6. Extra. de Major. & Obedientia. I quote the Edition of the Canon Law at Paris, 1612.

(*if he knew what he ſaid*) *when he affirm'd*, That he was as much greater then the Emperor, as the Sun was greater than the Moon.

2. *And therefore another* (u) *Canoniſt*, would have the Sun greater than the Moon (and ſo the Pope greater than the Emperor) Fifty ſeaven times.

3. *But this* (*as too little*) *does not pleaſe the Pope's Party and Paraſites, and therefore* Laurentius (*another Canoniſt*) *ſays*, That it is (x) manifeſt, that the Sun is greater than the Moon (ſo the Pope than the Emperor) an hundred forty ſeaven times. *I omit the fractions; for if the Pope be* 147. *times greater than the Emperor, methinks it might ſatisfie his Ambition, ſo that he needed not ſtand upon the fraction, or little overplus.*

4. *But this alſo comes far ſhort of that Magnitude, which they aſcribe to the Sun above the Moon,* (*and ſo to the Pope above the Emperor*) *for they tell us*, (y) That the Sun is greater than the Moon (7744½) ſeaven thouſand ſeaven hundred, forty four times, and one half more. *To ſuch a Prodigious greatneſs, does the Biſhop of* Rome *exalt himſelf. So that if St.* Paul *ſay true*, (That he is Antichriſt, who exalts himſelf above all Kings and Emperors) *then it will evidently follow, that the Pope is Antichriſt; for never man did, or* (*without Antichriſtian Pride and Impiety*) *can ſo exalt himſelf. They ſometimes tell us in their Law,* —(z) That the Papal Dignity is to be prefer'd to the Imperial, more then Gold is to Lead; *and* (*if* Gratian *ſay true*) *it was the Pope who ſaid ſo. And the Gloſs gives the reaſon of this Papal* (a) *Greatneſs above all Kings*; Becauſe Kings and Princes

(u) *Alias quinquagies ſeptics. Ita Notain Margine, ad dictum Cap. Solitæ verbo, Inter Solem & Lunam.* ibid.

(x) *Manifeſtum eſt, quod magnitudo Solis continet magnitudinem terræ Centies quadragies ſepties & duas medietates.* Vid. Additionem ad Gloſſam. verbo. Inter Solem & Lunam. Cap. Solitæ. 6.

(y) *Palam eſt, quod magnitudo Solis continet magnitudem Lunæ ſepties millies ſeptingenties & quadragies quater, & inſuper ejus medietatem.* Ibidem in dicta additione ad dictam Gloſſam.

(z) *Aurum non tam pretioſius eſt plumbo, quam Regia Dignitate ſit Altior Dignitas Sacerdotalis.* Gratian. Can. Duo ſunt. 10. Diſtinct. 96.

(a) *Quia Colla Regum & Principum ſubmittuntur Genibus Sacerdotum.* (By *Sacerdotes* here, the Popes are principally meant, as is evident both by the Text and the Gloſs) Gloſſa ad dictum Can. verbo. Duo ſunt.

Princes are to ſubmit their Necks to the Popes Knees; (*he might have ſaid, and their* (b) *Mouthes to the Popes Feet, which the Emperor is bound to kiſs*). *That this is Impious and Antichriſtian Doctrine, I think evident; and I have ſome reaſon to believe, that intelligent and impartial Judges will think ſo too, and yet it has heretofore, and ſtill is approved, and* (*as Catholick*) *received at* Rome. *For,* 1. *That Decretal of Pope* Innocent *the Third, was by* Gregory *the Ninth made a Law,* & (*amongſt other Decretals*) *by him commanded to be received as Law, in all* (c) *Univerſities and Papal Conſiſtories, about* 450. *years ago, and ſo continues to this day.* 2. *For the Gloſſes before-mentioned, they are not only in the* (d) *old Editions of their Law, but were approved and confirmed afterwards by* (e) Gregory *the Thirteenth* (*and ſo ſtand approved and confirmed to this day*) *who expreſly tells us,* That the Law being by his (*f*) command receiv'd, corrected and purged; no man (for the future) ſhould dare to add, detract, or change any thing in it.

In ſhort, whether the Champions of the Church of Rome *and Catholick Cauſe,* (*as they call it*) *will think what is ſaid in theſe Papers, worthy of any Anſwer, or no, I know not. But in caſe they do, I ſhall make them* (*if I miſtake not*) *a very fair offer, which* (*if accepted*) *will much leſſen their pains and labour, yet ſo, as* (*if they perform the Condition annexed*) *they may* (*as to my ſelf*) *effectually do their buſineſs, and make me their Proſelyte: The thing I mean is this; If they can from Scripture,* (*by any one Cogent and Concluding Argument*) *prove any one of theſe following Propoſitions* (*and unleſs they be*

(b) *Papa excipit Imperatorem ad oſculum pedis — ut primum videt Papam, detecto Capite, illum, genu terram tangens, veneratur, — & Pontificis pedes Devotè oſculatur.* Lib. Sacrarum Ceremoniarum, Rom. 1560. l. 1. Tit. 5. p. 22. Col. 2. 3.

(c) *Volentes ut hæc tantum Compilatione utantur Univerſi in Judiciis & in Scholis,* &c. Greg. 9. in Literis Acad. Bononienſi, dat. 1230. Juri Canonico Præfixis. Edit. Lugduni. 1661.

(d) Edit. Pariſ. 1520. cum Gloſſis.

(e) Vide Bullam Greg. 13. datam Romæ, Anno 1580. Corpori Juris Canonici præfixam.

(f) *Nulli liceat Libris Canonici Juris, de mandato noſtro Correctis, Recognitis, & Expurgatis, quicquam addere, detrahere, vel immutare,* &c. Ibid. dicta Greg. 13. Bulla.

all proved, their Papal Monarchy cannot stand) *I will grant the rest, and give them the Cause. I say then, if they can make it appear,*

1. That our blessed Saviour before his Ascension, did constitute *Peter* his Vicar, and gave him such a Monarchical Supremacy and Jurisdiction (as is (g) now contended for) over the Apostles and the whole Church. *For if* Peter *had no such Power he could not transfer it to his Successors; it being impossible, that they should have that Power* (Jure Successionis) *which their Predecessor never had.*
2. If they can prove, that St. *Peter*, while he lived, did exercise such Power and Supream Jurisdiction, even over the Apostles, &c. *By their own* (h) *Computation, St.* Peter *lived* 34. *or* 35. *years after the Ascension of our blessed Saviour, and was* (*as they*) *Bishop of* Antioch, 7. *and of* Rome, 25. *years. Now if it neither do, nor can appear, that in all that time he exercised any such Monarchical Power or Jurisdiction; we may safely conclude, either that he had no such Power* (*which is most true*) *or betray'd his trust in not making use of it, for his Masters Glory, and his Churches good; which* (*I suppose*) *our Adversaries will not say. In this Case,* Idem est non esse & non apparere; *and therefore our Adversaries must pardon us, if we do not believe* (*what they cannot prove*) *St.* Peters *Monarchy.*
3. *But let it be supposed* (*which neither has been, nor can be proved*) *that* Peter *had, and executed such Power;* let them make it appear that it was not Personal and Temporary, to cease with his Person (as the Apostleship did) but to be transferred

to

(g) They tell us, that it was our blessed Saviour himself, who Constituted *Peter* and his Successors, Supream Monarchs of the Catholick Church. *Christus Catholicam Ecclesiam, Uni Soli in Terris Petro, Petrique Successori Rom. Pontifici, in Potestatis Plenitudine, tradidit Gubernandam.* So Pius the Fifth in this Bull of Excommunication of *Eliz. In Principio.* And *Bellarmine* says —— *Successio ex Christi Instituto, & Jure Divino est, quia Ipse Christus Instituit in Petro Pontificatum, ideo quicunque Petro succedit, a Christo accipit Pontificatum.* De Rom. Pont. l 2. c. 12. §. ut autem. *Cum Papa in Petri Cathedra Sedeat, summum in eo Dignitatis gradum, nonnullis Humanis Constitutionibus, sed Divinitus datum agnoscit.* Catechis. Trident. Part. 2. c 7. De Ordinis Sacramento. §. 28. vide Can. Sacrosancta. 2. Dist. 22. & Glossam & Turrecrematam. Idem.

(h) *Baronius* says, that *Peter* suffered Martyrdom *Anno Christi.* 69. & therefore 34. or 35. years after our blessed Saviours Passion. Annal. Tom. 1. ad Ann. 69. §. 1.

to ſome (*i*) Succeſſor. *For if it was temporary, and ceas'd with St.* Peter's *Perſon, then whoever (after* Peter's *death) pretends to that Power, is not* bonæ fidei poſſeſſor, *but an Impious and Antichriſtian* Uſurper.

4. *But let all thoſe Particulars be ſuppoſed, (which being untrue, cannot poſſibly be proved) that* Peter *had and executed ſuch Power, and that it was to be tranſmitted to his Succeſſor*; Let them make it appear that the Biſhop of *Rome* was that (*k*) Succeſſor, that *Peter* was (as they ſay) 25. years Biſhop of *Rome*, or 25. days, or that he ever was at *Rome*: *For, if it be ſo far from truth that* Peter *was 25. years Biſhop of* Rome, *that it cannot appear from Scripture, that he was ever Biſhop there at all, or that he ever was at* Rome. *It will evidently follow, that the Pope is not St.* Peter's *Succeſſor, and ſo can have no Title* (Jure Succeſſionis) *to that Supremacy, they ſay*, Peter *had: It being impoſſible that the Pope ſhould ſucceed* Peter, *if he never preceeded him in the Biſhoprick of* Rome.

5. *Let them make it appear*, that our bleſſed Saviour, while on Earth, either exercis'd or had ſuch a Temporal Monarchy, as the (*l*) Pope now challenges as his Vicar. *For unleſs this appear, all their pretences to ſuch Power, (as Vicars of our B. Saviour) will be vain and irrational*; *it being impoſſible that the Pope or* Peter *ſhould derive from him that power which he himſelf neither had, nor ever here on Earth exercis'd.*

Theſe are the Foundations upon which the Papal Monarchy (Spiritual and Temporal) is built; *and if*

(i) *Bellarmine* ſays, that 'tis evident in Scripture that *Peter*'s Supremacy was to deſcend to a Succeſſor —— *Aliquem Petro Succedere, deducitur Evidenter ex Scripturis.* De Rom. Pont. l. 2. c. 12. §. Obſervandum Tertio.

(k) *Bellarmine* tells us, that it is not expreſly in Scripture, that the Pope is *Peter*'s Succeſſor, but that muſt be proved by Apoſtolical Tradition. *Rom. Pontificem ſuccedere Petro, non habetur expreſſe in Scripturis, ſed habetur ex traditione Apoſtolicâ.* Bellarm. Loco dicto.

(*l*) They conſtantly tell us, the Pope has two Swords; and of the Temporal Sword they ſay —— *Figurat Pontificalis hic gladius poteſtatem ſummam Temporalem, à Chriſto ejus Vicario collatam; juxta illud, data eſt mihi omnis Poteſtas in Cœlo & in Terrâ, & alibi, dominabitur à Mari uſque ad Mare, & à Flumine, uſque ad Terminos Orbis Terrarum.* Liber Sacrarum Ceremoniorum Eccleſiæ Rom. Romæ. 1560. Lib. 1. Tit. 7. De Enſe benedicendo, p. 36. Col. 1.

theſe fail, the whole Fabrick will and muſt fall; and therefore they are concern'd, by ſome real and rational proof, to make them good. Now if our Adverſaries can and will make it appear, from Sacred Scripture, that Peter *ever had or exerciſed ſuch a Power, as is pretended; that it was not perſonal in him, but to be transmitted to his Succeſſor; that he was* 25. *years Biſhop of* Rome, *and actually transferred that Power to his Succeſſor there; or that our bleſſed Saviour ever had or exercis'd ſuch a terrene and temporal power, as they pretend the Pope (as his Vicar) has from him: I ſay, let them make all, or any one of theſe Particulars appear from Scripture, and I will confeſs, and retract my error. Now is the Condition unjuſt or unequal, when I require Scripture proof. For they themſelves conſtantly affirm that the Pope has Right to his Monarchical Supremacy* Jure Divino; *by the Conſtitution of our bleſſed Saviour, and Divine Right; and this their Popes, Canoniſts and Divines (with great noiſe and confidence, but no reaſon) endeavour to prove from Scripture, miſerably miſtaken and miſapply'd. I know, that their late* (m) *Jeſuitical Methodiſts (ſo much* (n) *magnify'd by their Party) require of Proteſtants to confute their Popiſh Doctrines (Tranſubſtantiation, the Sacrifice of the Maſs, Purgatory, &c.)* by expreſs words of Scripture) *not admitting of Conſequences, however deduced from plain Texts as Premiſſes. This method of theirs (being irrational and* (o) *demonſtrated ſo to be) I ſhall not tye them too: But if they can prove any of the aforeſaid Poſitions by the* expreſs words of Scripture, *or by good Conſequences deduced from it, or (what they pretend to) Univerſal and Apoſtolical Tradition; I ſhall admit the proof. Nay,*

(m) Vide Methodum Veronianam, ſeu modum, quo quilibet Catholicus poteſt Solis Bibliis, Religionis prætenſæ Miniſtrum evidenter mutum reddere, &c. Authore Franciſco Verono Pariſienſi, Societatis Jeſu Theolog. Colon. Agrip. 1610. Vide Jac. Maſenij meditatam Concordiam Proteſtantium cum Catholicis, ex verbo Dei. Edit. Colon. 1661.

(n) Franciſ. Veroni Scientiam, è doctiſſimâ Societate Jeſu prodeuntem, veneramur, ſententiam libenter ſequimur, & labores, optimo ſucceſſu à Deo donatos, honoramus. Adrian. & Petrus Walenburch in Exam. Princip. fidei, &c. Exam. 3. §. 1. num. 3. p. 111.

(o) Vide Diſput. de fidei ex ſcripturis demonſtratione, contra novam nonnullorum Methodū Per Joh. Dallæum. 8°. Genevæ, 1610.

I shall make our Popish Adversaries two further, and (if that be possible) fairer offers.

1. *Let them prove by any just and concluding reason whatsoever, that any Christian Church in the World acknowledg'd, or the Church of Rome her self assumed and publickly pleaded for such a Papal Supremacy, as* (p) *now they pretend to, for* 1000. *years after our B. Saviour; and (for my own part) I will confess and retract my Error.*

2. *Let them prove, by any such concluding reason, that any Church in the World (Eastern or Western, Greek or Latin) did acknowledge (what now the Pope and his Party so earnestly and vainly contend for) the* Popes Infallibility, *and* his Supremacy over all General Councils, *for* 1500. *years after our blessed Saviour; and for my part,* Cedat Jülus Agris, manus dabimus captivas, *I will retract what here I have affirmed, and be (what I hope I never shall be) their Proselyte.*

To Conclude, I have no more to say, (my Adversaries will think I have said too much) save only to desire the Readers, who sincerely and impartially desire truth and satisfaction, to read and consider the Margent as well as the Text. In this, they have my Positions, and the proofs of them, in plain English: In the Margent, the Authorities and Authors I rely upon, in their own words, and the Language in which they writ: and I have (for the Readers ease, not my own) cited not only the Authors and their Books, but the Chapter, Paragraph, Page, and mostly the Editions of them: That so the Reader may with more ease, find the places

(p) They do now pretend to *potestatem Summam Temporalem*; as the Book of their Sacred Ceremonies (a little before cited) tells us. That our blessed Saviour gave *Peter*, (& in him the Pope) *Cœlestis & Terreni Imperij Jura.* Can. Omnes. 1. dist. 22. Power to depose Kings and Emperors, absolve their Subjects from Oaths of Allegiance, and dispose of their Dominions. Plat. in vita Greg. 7. Conc. Lateran. sub. Innocent. 3. Can.. de Hæret. 3. Hence it was, that *Bonif.* 8. (that Prodigy of Antichristian Pride and Impiety) in the Solemn Jubilee shew'd himself to the People the first day in his Pontificalibus, and the next day, *Imperiali habitu, Insula Cæsarea Insignis, gladium ante se nudatum jussit deferri & sedens alta voce testatur; Ecce duo gladij.* Vide Paralip. ad Chron. Urspergen. ad An. 1294. p. 344.

ces quoted, and judge whether I have cited and tranſlated them aright. It is notoriouſly known, that our Popiſh Adverſaries have publiſhed many forged Canons and Councils, many ſpurious (a) Decretals, and ſuppoſititious Tracts, under the names of Primitive Fathers, and ancient Biſhops; that they have ſhamefully corrupted the Canons of Legitimate (b) Councils, and thouſands of other Authors; making them (by adding and ſubſtracting words or Sentences) ſay what they never meant, or not to ſay what indeed they did both mean and ſay: and this they themſelves have (without ſhame or honeſty) publickly own'd, in their Expurgatory Indices; and after all this fraud and falſification of Records, theſe Apocryphal Books and ſuppoſititious Authors, are continually produced by them (for proofs of their Errors) againſt Proteſtants who well know, and (as many ſober men of their own Communion) juſtly condemn ſuch impious Roman Arts—Nec tali auxilio, nec defenſoribus iſtis Chriſtus eget. *Truth needs no ſuch forg'd and falſe Medium's to maintain it; nor will any honeſt man uſe them. Sure I am, I have not, in this Diſcourſe, built the truth of my Poſitions upon the Teſtimonies of our own Proteſtant Authors, (knowing that our Adverſaries would with ſcorn reject their Teſtimony) nor*

(a) It is notoriouſly known how many Decretal Epiſtles have been forged, and fathered upon the ancient Biſhops. I ſhall only inſtance in the fifth Epiſtle of that pious Pope and Martyr, *Clemens* the firſt; in which he pleads for a *community* of all things in the world, *even of Wives. Communis uſus Omnium, quæ ſunt in hoc mundo, Omnibus eſſe Debuit. In Omnibus Sunt Sine Dubio, & Conjuges.* *Joh. Sichardus* and *James Merlin* have that Epiſtle, and thoſe very words; & *Gratian* has refer'd them into the Canon Law. Can. dilectiſſimis. 2. Cauſ. 12. Quæſt. 1. and there they are ſtill, in all the Editions of that Law, even that corrected and approved by Pope *Gregory* the Thirteenth.

(b) I ſhall inſtance only in one, the 28. Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon*, as it is ſhamefully corrupted in Gratian. Can. Renovant. 6. Diſt. 22. where, 1. It is in the Original, ὁριζομεθα, *definimus, ſtatuimus*; for which *Gratian* has, *Petimus*. 2. In the Original Canon, it is πρεσβυτέρα Ρωμη, *Senior Roma*; but *Gratian* has *Superior Roma*. 3. In the Original, it is, ἴσα πρεσβεῖα, *Æqualia Privilegia*; But *Gratian* has *Similia privilegia:* as being unwilling that *Conſtantinople* ſhould have equal priviledges with *Rome*. 4. In the Original Canon, it is—ἡ ἐν τοῖς Ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς, &c. That *Conſtantinople* ſhould be equal to *Rome*, in Eccleſiaſtical Matters, *etiam in Eccleſiaſticis*. But *Gratian* (in contradiction to the Canon) ſays, *Non tamen in Eccleſiaſticis*, &c. So it was in *Gratian*, in the old Editions; only in the Later Editions of *Gratian* (An. 1612. 1618. 1661. &.) this laſt corruption is acknowledg'd, and (which is not uſual) mended. But other corruptions remain ſtill, in their laſt and beſt Editions of *Gratian*.

of

of any ſuppoſititious or ſpurious ones. The Teſtimonies and Proofs I have quoted, and rely upon, are drawn from Scripture, *the* genuine Works of the ancient Fathers and Councils, *or* (*which* ad hominem, *muſt be valid*) *from* their own Councils, *the* Popes Bulls, *their* Canon Law, *their* Caſuiſts, Schoolmen, Summiſts, *the* Trent Catechiſm, *the* Book of the Sacred Ceremonies of the Rom. Church, *their approved and* received Publick Offices, (*ſuch as their* Miſſal, Breviary, Ritual, Pontifical, &c.) *which Authorities* (*if I do not miſquote, or miſtake their meaning*) *are, and* (*to them*) *muſt be juſt proofs of thoſe Poſitions for which I have produced them. But let the Evidence of the Teſtimonies, and the Authority of the Authors quoted, be what it will; I have little hope, that they will gain any aſſent from our Adverſaries; ſo long as they believe the* Infallibility of their Pope and Church, *and their Learned Men are* ſolemnly ſworn, firmly to believe their new Trent Creed, (*the whole Body of Popiſh Errors*) to their laſt breath, *and to Anathematize and Damn what Doctrine ſoever contradicts it. For while they are poſſeſs'd with theſe Principles, it may be truly ſaid of them, what was ſaid of the* Luciferian Hereticks *in St.* Hierome——Facilius eos Vinci poſſe, quam perſuaderi, *you may ſooner baffle, then perſwade them: They will* (*in deſpite of Premiſſes*) *hold the Concluſion; nor ſhall the cleareſt demonſtration overcome their blind Zeal and Affection to their Catholick Cauſe. However, that God Almighty would be graciouſly pleaſed to bleſs us and them, with a clear knowledge*

ledge of Sacred Truth, with a firm belief, and (in dangerous times) upon undanted and pious profeſſion of it, is and ſhall be the Prayer of

Thy Friend and Servant

Oct. 3.
1680. in Chriſt,

T. L.

The

The Damnation and Excommunication of *Elizabeth* Queen of *England*, and her Adherents, with an Addition of other Puniſhments.

Damnatio & Excommunicatio Elizabethæ *Reginæ* Angliæ, *eique Adhærentium, cum aliarum pœnarum Adjectione.*

Pius Biſhop, Servant to God's Servants, for a perpetual memorial of the matter.

Pius *Epiſcopus, Servus Servorum Dei, ad perpetuam Rei memoriam.*

HE that reigneth on High, to whom is given all Power in Heaven and in Earth, committed one Holy, Catholick and Apoſtolick Church (out of which there is no Salvation) to one alone upon Earth, namely, to *Peter* the Prince of the Apoſtles, and to *Peter*'s Succeſſor the Biſhop of *Rome*, to be governed in fulneſs of Power. Him alone he made Prince over all People, and all Kingdoms, to pluck up, deſtroy, ſcatter, conſume, plant and build, that he may contain the faithful that are knit together with the band of Charity in the Unity of the Spirit, and preſent them ſpotleſs, and umblameable to their Saviour.

REgnans in Excelſis, cui data eſt Omnis in Cælo & in Terra Poteſtas, unam Sanctam, Catholicam & Apoſtolicam Eccleſiam (extra quam nulla eſt ſalus) ſoli in terris, videlicet, Apoſtolorum Principi Petro, Petrique *Succeſſori Romano Pontifici, in Poteſtatis plenitudine tradidit Gubernandam. Hunc unum ſuper omnes Gentes, & omnia Regna Principem conſtituit, qui evellat, deſtruat, diſſipet, diſperdat, plantet, & ædificet, ut fidelem populum, mutuæ Charitatis nexu conſtrictum, in unitate Spiritus contineat, ſalvumque & incolumem ſuo exhibeat ſalvatori.*

Sect. 1. In diſcharge of which Function, we which are by God's goodneſs called to the Government of the aforeſaid Church, do ſpare no pains, labouring with all earneſtneſs, that Unity, and the Catholick Religion (which the Author thereof hath for the trial of his Children's Faith, and for our amendment, ſuffered to be puniſhed with ſo great Afflictions) might be preſerved uncorrupt: But the number of the ungodly hath gotten ſuch power, there is now no place left in the whole World, which they have not aſſayed to corrupt with their moſt wicked Doctrines: Amongſt others, *Elizabeth*, the pretended Queen of *England*, a Slave of Wickedneſs, lending thereunto her helping hand, with whom, as in a Sanctuary, the moſt pernicious of all men have found a Refuge. This very Woman having ſeized on the Kingdom, and monſtrouſly uſurping the place of Supream Head of the Church in all *England*, and the chief Authority and Juriſdiction thereof, hath again brought back the ſaid Kingdom into miſerable deſtruction, which was then newly reduced to the moſt Catholick Faith and good Fruits.

Sect. 1. *Quo quidem in munere obeundo, Nos ad prædictæ Eccleſiæ gubernacula Dei Benignitate vocati, nullum laborem intermittimus, omni operâ contendentes, ut ipſa Unitas, & Catholica Religio (quam illius Auctor ad probandam ſuorum fidem, & correctionem noſtram, tantis procellis conflictari permiſit) integra conſervetur. Sed Impiorum numerus tantum potentia invaluit, ut nullus jam in Orbe locus ſit relictus, quem illi peſſimis doctrinis corrumpere non tentârint, adnitente inter cæteros flagitiorum ſervâ* Elizabeth, *prætenſâ* Angliæ *Reginâ; ad quam, veluti ad aſylum, omnium infeſtiſſimi profugium invenerunt. Hæc eadem, Regno occupato, ſupremi Eccleſiæ capitis locum, in omni* Angliâ, *ejuſque præcipuam Auctoritatem atque Juriſdictionem monſtruoſe ſibi uſurpans, regnum ipſum jam tum ad Fidem Catholicam & bonam frugem reductum, rurſus in exitium miſerum revocavit.*

Sect. 2. For having by ſtrong hand inhibited the exerciſe of the

Sect. 2. *Uſu namque veræ Religionis, quam ab illius deſertore* Henri-

true

true Religion, which *Mary* lawful Queen of famous memory, had by the help of this See reſtored, after it had been formerly overthrown by *Henry* the Eighth, a Revolter therefrom; and following and embracing the Errors of Hereticks, ſhe hath removed the Royal Council conſiſting of the Engliſh Nobility, and filled it with obſcure men, being Hereticks, oppreſſed the Embracers of the Catholick Faith, placed impious Preachers, Miniſters of Iniquity, aboliſhed the Sacrifice of the Maſs, Prayers, Faſtings, choice of Meats, unmarried Life, and the Catholick Rites and Ceremonies. Commanded Books to be read in the whole Realm containing manifeſt Hereſie; and impious Myſteries and Inſtitutions, by her ſelf entertained, and obſerved according to the Preſcript of *Calvin*, to be likewiſe obſerved by her Subjects; preſumed to throw Biſhops, Parſons of Churches, and other Catholick Prieſts, out of their Churches and Benefices; and to beſtow them and other Church Livings upon Hereticks, and to determine of Church Cauſes, prohibited the Prelates,

co VIII. *olim everſam, Claræ Mem.* Maria *Regina legitima, hujus Sedis Præſidio reparaverat, potenti manu inhibito, ſecutiſque & amplexis Hæreticorum erroribus, Regium Concilium ex* Anglicâ *Nobilitate confectum diremit, illudque obſcuris hominibus Hæreticis complevit, Catholicæ Fidei cultores oppreſſit, improbos Concionatores, atque Impietatum Adminiſtros repoſuit, Miſſæ Sacrificium, Preces, Jejunia, Ciborum delectum, Ritusque Catholicos abolevit. Libros manifeſtam Hereſim continentes, toto Regno proponi, impia Myſteria, & Inſtituta ad* Calvini *Præſcriptum à ſe ſuſcepta, & obſervata, etiam à ſubditis obſervari mandavit. Epiſcopos, Eccleſiarum Rectores, & alios Sacerdotes Catholicos, ſuis Eccleſiis, & Beneficiis ejicere, ac de illis & aliis Eccleſiaſticis rebus, in hæreticos homines diſponere, deque Eccleſiæ cauſis decernere auſa, Prælatis, Clero, & Populo, ne Romanam Eccleſiam agnoſcerent, neve ejus Præceptis, Sanctionibuſque Canonicis obtemperarent, Interdixit; pleroſque in nefarias leges ſuas venire, & Romani Pontificis Auctoritatem atque obedientiam abjurare; ſeque ſolam in Temporalibus & Spiritualibus Dominam agnoſcere jurejurando coegit;*

Clergy, & People to acknowledge the Church of *Rome*, or obey the Precepts and Canonical Sanctions thereof, compelled moſt of them to condeſcend to her wicked Laws, and to abjure the Authority and Obedience of the Biſhop of *Rome*, and to acknowledge her to be ſole Lady in Temporal and Spiritual matters, and this by Oath; impoſed Penalties and Puniſhments upon thoſe which obeyed not, and exacted them of thoſe which perſevered in the Unity of the Faith, and their Obedience aforeſaid, caſt the Catholick Prelates and Rectors of Churches in Priſon, where many of them, being ſpent with long languiſhing and ſorrow, miſerably ended their lives. All which things, ſeeing they are manifeſt and notorious to all Nations, and by the graveſt Teſtimony of very many ſo ſubſtantially proved, that there is no place at all left for Excuſe, Defence, or Evaſion.

Sect. 3. We ſeeing that impieties and wicked actions are multiplied one upon another; & moreover, that the perſecution of the faithful, & affliction for Religion, groweth every day heavier & heavier, through the inſtigation and means of the ſaid *Elizabeth*; becauſe we underſtand her Mind to be ſo hardned and indurate, that ſhe hath not only contemned the godly Requeſts and Admonitions of

pœnas & ſupplicia in eos qui dicto non eſſent Audientes, Impoſuit; eaſdemque ab iis, qui in unitate fidei, & prædicta Obedientia perſeverârunt, Exegit. Catholicos Antiſtites, & Eccleſiarum Rectores in vincula conjecit, ubi multi diuturno Languore & Triſtitia Confecti, Extremum vitæ diem miſerè finiverunt. Quæ omnia cum apud Omnes Nationes perſpicua & notoria ſunt, & graviſſimo quamplurimorum Teſtimonio, ita comprobata, ut nullus omnino locus Excuſationis, Defenſionis, aut Tergiverſationis relinquatur.

Sect. 3. *Nos, multiplicantibus aliis atque aliis ſuper alias Impietatibus, & facinoribus, & præterea fidelium perſecutione, Religioniſq; afflictione, impulſu & Operâ d.* Elizabeth *quotidie magis Ingraveſcente, quoniam illius animum ita obſirmatum atque induratum Intelligimus, ut non modo pias Catholicorum Principum de ſanitate & converſione, preces, monitioneſque contempſerit, ſed ne hujus quidem ſedis ad ipſam hac de cauſâ*

Catho-

Catholick Princes, concerning her healing and converſion, but alſo hath not ſo much as permitted the Nuncios of this See, to croſs the Seas into *England*; are ſtrained of neceſſity to betake our ſelves to the Weapons of Juſtice againſt her, not being able to mitigate our ſorrow, that we are drawn to take puniſhment upon one, to whoſe Anceſtors the whole State of Chriſtendom hath been ſo much bounden. Being therefore ſupported with his Authority, whoſe pleaſure it was to place Us (though unable for ſo great a burthen) in this Supream Throne of Juſtice, we do out of the fulneſs of our Apoſtolick power, declare the aforeſaid *Elizabeth*, being an Heretick, and a favourer of Hereticks, and her Adherents in the matters aforeſaid, to have incurred the ſentence of Anathema, and to be cut off from the Unity of the Body of Chriſt.

Nuncios in Angliam *trajicere permiſerit; ad Arma Juſtitiæ contra eam de neceſſitate converſi, dolorem lenire non poſſumus, quod Adducamur in unam animadvertere, Cujus majores de Republicâ Chriſtianâ tantopere meruere. Illius itaque Auctoritate ſuffulti, Qui Nos in hoc Supremo Juſtitiæ Throno, (licet tanto Oneri Impares) voluit Collocare, de Apoſtolicæ poteſtatis plenitudine declaramus prædictam* Elizabeth *Hæreticam, hæreticorumque fautricem, eique adhærentes in prædictis, Anathematis ſententiam incurriſſe, eſſeque à Chriſti Corporis unitate præciſos.*

Sect. 4. And moreover, we do declare Her to be deprived of her pretended Title to the Kingdom aforeſaid, & of all Dominion, Dignity, and Priviledge whatſoever.

Sect. 4. *Quin etiam ipſam prætenſo Regni prædicti jure, necnon omni & quocunque Dominio, Dignitate, Privilegioque privatam.*

Sect. 5. And alſo the Nobility, Subjects, and People of the ſaid Kingdom, and all others, which have in any ſort ſworn unto her, to be for ever abſolved from any ſuch Oath, and all manner of Du-

Sect. 5. *Et etiam Proceres, ſubditos, & populos dicti Regni, ac cæteros omnes qui illi quomodocunque juraverunt. A Juramento hujuſmodi, ac omni prorſus Dominii, Fidelitatis, & obſequii debito, perpetuo abſolutos,*

ty,

ty, of Dominion, Allegiance, and Obedience; As we alſo do by Authority of theſe preſents abſolve them, and do deprive the ſame *Elizabeth* of her pretended Title to the Kingdom, and all other things abovesaid. And we do Command and Interdict all and every the Noblemen, Subjects, people, and others aforesaid, that they preſume not to obey her, or her Monitions, Mandates, and Laws: And thoſe which ſhall do the contrary, We do innodate with the like Sentence of Anathema.

prout Nos illos Præſentium Auctoritate abſolvimus, & privamus eandem Elizabeth *prætenſo Jure Regni, aliiſque Omnibus ſupradictis. Præcipimuſque & Interdicimus Univerſis & ſingulis proceribus, ſubditis, populis, & aliis prædictis, ne illi ejuſve monitis, Mandatis, & Legibus audeant obedire. Qui ſecus egerint, eos ſimili Anathematis Sententiâ innodamus.*

Sect. 6. And becauſe it were a matter of too much difficulty, to convey theſe preſents to all places whereſoever it ſhall be needful; our will is, that the Copies thereof, under a publick Notaries hand, and ſealed with the Seal of an Eccleſiaſtical Prelate, or of his Court, ſhall carry altogether the ſame credit with all people, Judicial and Extrajudicial, as theſe preſents ſhould do, if they were exhibited or ſhewed. Given at *Rome*, at St. *Peters*, in the Year of the Incarnation of our Lord, 1570. the Fifth of the Calends of *May*, and of our Popedom the Fifth year.

Sect. 6. *Quia vero difficile nimis eſſet, Præſentes quocunque illis Opus erit perferre, volumus, ut eorum exempla, Notarii publici manu, & Prælati Eccleſiaſtici, ejuſve Curiæ Sigillo Obſignata eandem illam prorſus fidem in Judicio, & extra illud, ubique Gentium faciant, quam ipſæ Præſentes facerent, ſi eſſent exhibitæ vel oſtenſæ. Dat'* Romæ, *apud Sanctum* Petrum, *Anno Incarnationis Dominicæ* 1570. 5. *Cal. Maij Pontificat' noſtri Anno* 5.

SOME

SOME ANIMADVERSIONS AND OBSERVATIONS

Upon the Impious

Damnation & Excommunication OF Q. Elizabeth BY PIUS V. *Anno* 1570.

Extat hæc Bulla in Bullario Romano. Romæ 1638. Tom. 2. p. 229.

BEfore I come to a particular and distinct Examination of the several parts and paragraphs of this Impious Popish Bull, I shall in general observe,

1. That *Pius* V. was not the first or only Pope, who usurped this Extravagant and Antichristian power over Kings and Emperors; to damn, depose, and deprive them of all their Royal Rights and Imperial *Observ.* 1.

perial Juriſdiction; for both his Predeceſſors and Succeſſors approved, and with prodigious pride and impiety, exercis'd ſuch power. That this may appear, I ſhall give the Reader ſome Inſtances, extant upon Record, in their own Popiſh Annals and Hiſtories.

1. Pope (*a*) *Conſtantine* in a Council of *Italian* Biſhops (it was about the Year 711.) Anathematiſes all who deny'd the worſhipping of Images, and (*b*) *particularly, and by name damns the Emperor* Philippicus *to the Torments of Hell.* So *Carolus Sigonius* tells us, and *Martinus Polonus*, and the *Faſciculus Temporum* concur with him.
2. After Pope *Conſtantine*, *Gregory* the ſecond, and *Gregory* the third, ſucceed (*c*); and both of them Excommunicate the Emperor *Leo Iſaurus*, for this only Crime, becauſe he was againſt worſhipping of Images; and though the *Italians* had ſworn Allegiance to him, yet they null that Oath: And the Hiſtorian commends theſe Actions of thoſe two Popes, as excellent Examples for Poſterity. And *Platina* ſays, that *Gregory* the third (*d*) *Excommunicated the Emperor* Leo, *and deprived him of his Empire.*
3. To *Gregory* the third, ſucceeded Pope *Zachary*, and (if *Gratian* ſay true) he (*e*) depoſed *Childericus* King of *France*, and abſolves his Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance, and gives his Kingdom to *Pipin*: And this he did, not for the *great crimes of* Childeric, *but becauſe he was unprofitable, and unfit for the Government*; not that he was *Inſufficient* (ſays the (*f*) *Gloſs*) but becauſe

(*a*) Carolus Sigonius de Regno Italiæ, lib. 3. pag. 58.

(*b*) *Omnium Conſenſu, omnes qui Imaginibus venerationem negarent, damnati*; & Philippicus *ipſe* Nominatim, Diro in eum compoſito Carmine, Pœnis Inferorum devotus. Ibid.

(*c*) Car. Sigonius de Regno Italiæ. l. 9. p. 219. *Extabant præclara* Gregorii 2. & 3. *exempla, qui* Leoni Iſauro *Imperatori, Sacris Interdicere, & Juratâ* Italiæ *obedientiâ ſpoliare non dubitârant, uno eo Crimine, quod Imaginibus ſe Inimicum præbuiſſet.*

(d) *Gregorius* 3. Leonem *Imperio & Communione fidelium privat.* Plat. in vita Greg. 3.

(*e*) Zacharias *Papa Regem* Francorum, *non tam pro ejus Iniquitatibus, quamquod erat inutilis depoſuit: & Francigenas à juramento fidelitatis abſolvit.* Gratian. Can. Alius. Cauſ. 15. Quæſt. 6.

(f) *Non quod inſufficiens ſed quod diſſolutus erat cum mulieribus, & effœminatus.* Gloſſ. ibid. verbo *Inutilis.*

cauſe *he was Effeminate, and diſſolute with Women.* And from this Canon, *Joh. Semeca* (the (*f*) Gloſſator) infers, *That the Pope may depoſe the Emperor*; and proves it by citing other Canons, And by the Authority of Pope (*g*) *Gelaſius*, who tells *Anaſtaſius* the Emperor, That he had power to Depoſe him, and proves it from the Example of this Pope *Zachary*. I know, that what *Gratian*, and the Canoniſt, ſay, of Pope *Zachary*'s Depoſing *Childeric*, is evidently untrue, (and by many (*h*) demonſtrated ſo to be) yet it ſtands uncenſur'd in their laſt and beſt (*i*) Edition of the Canon Law, which Pope *Gregory* XIII. (*k*) approved and publiſh'd, as moſt correct. And they further tell us, That *Clement* VIII. publiſhed an (*l*) Exact Correction of all the Gloſſes and Additions to the Canon Law, and yet this of Pope *Zachary*'s depoſing *Childeric* (and, what the Gloſs ſays of it) is neither left out, nor any way cenſur'd. Whence it is evident, that they approve the Doctrine of depoſing Kings, and (having no juſt reaſon for it) forge Inſtances to prove it.

4. Pope *Hildebrand*, or (*m*) *Gregory* VII. depoſeth the Emperor *Henry* IV. *by the Authority given* (n) *by God*, (as he ſays) *of binding and looſing both in Heaven and Earth: And then he* (o) *abſolves his Subjects from their Oath of Fidelity, and then prohibits them to obey him.* This Bull is dated at *Rome*, *Anno Domini* 1075. and five years after he Excommunicates, and Depoſes him again

(f) *Non quod Inſufficiens ſed quod diſſolutus erat cum Mulieribus, & Effæminatus.* Gloſſ. ibid. verbo *Inutilis.*

(g) Gloſſ. ibid. verbo *Alius.*

(h) Vid. Joh. Launoium Epiſt. Tom. 7. p. 117, 118, &c. & p. 245, 246, &c. Hottomanni Franco-Galliam, cap. 13. p. 96, 97, 98.

(i) Vid. Edit. Paris 1612. & 1618.

(k) Vid. Bullam Gregorij 13. dat. Romæ 1. Die Julij 1580.

(l) Vide Indicem Librorum prohibitorum Luſitanicum Olyſipone, 1624. p. 350. in Carolo Molinæo.

(m) Vide Bullarium Romanum Romæ Anno 1638. Tom. 1. p. 49.

(n) Poteſtate à Deo data Ligandi & Solvendi in Cœlo, & in Terra. Ibid.

(o) *Omnes Chriſtianos à vinculo Juramenti, quod ſibi faciunt, aut facient, abſolvo, & ut nullus ei ſerviat, ſicut Regi, interdico.* Ibid. §. 1.

again 1080. And *implores the Aſſiſtance of* Peter *and* Paul, *in this his Excommunication and Depoſition of the Emperor; that the World may* (p) *know, that as they have power to bind and looſe in Heaven; ſo they have power on Earth to give and take away Empires, Kingdoms, Principalities, Dukedoms, Earldoms, and* (*according as they ſhall deſerve, and he is* (q) *Judge of that*) *the poſſeſſions of all men. This power,* he ſays, Peter *had; and ſo he, and the Biſhops of* Rome *have it too, and that from God, as Vicars of Chriſt, and* Peter's *Succeſſors.* And ſo by this moſt Erroneous and Impious Doctrine, the Popes have a Power (which neither *Peter,* nor any, nor all the Apoſtles ever had) to diſpoſe of all mens Temporal Eſtates in the World, whether they be Supream or Subjects.

5. After this, Pope *Gregory* IX. (*r*) Excommunicates the Emperor *Friderick* II. Abſolves his Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance, lays an Interdict on all his Cities, Caſtles, and Villages, Excommunicates all that favour him, or any way aſſiſt or obey him, commands the *German* Biſhops (upon pain of Excommunication) ſolemnly to publiſh this Excommunication with all their Impious Solemnities, ringing of Bells, lighting, and then extinguiſhing Candles, *&c.*

6. After this, Pope (*ſ*) *Innocent* IV. (in the like form) Excommunicates and Depoſes the ſaid *Frederick.* The *Lemma* or Title prefix'd to the Bull is thus (*t*), *The Damnation and Excommunication*

(p) *Ut Mundus Intelligat, quia ſi poteſtis in Cœlo ligare & ſolvere, poteſtis in Terra Imperia, Regna, Principatus, Marchias, Ducatus, Comitatus, & Omnium Hominum poſſeſſiones, pro meritis tollere, Unicuique & Concedere. In dicto Bullario Roman. Bulla Excommunicationis. Hen.* 4. §. 10. p. 51. Col. 1.

(q) *Sive Roman. Pontificem Supremum in Eccleſiâ Dei Judicem.* Ita Gregorius 13. in Bulla data Romæ, 8 Apr. 1575. In Ecloge Bullarum Lugduni. 1582. p. 359. Col. 2.

(*r*) Vide Bullam, 13. Gregorij 9. datam Romæ. Anno 1239. In Bullario Romano, Tom. 1. p. 89, 90.

(*ſ*) Vid. Conſtitutionem Ejus 3. dat. Lugduni 1245. In Bullario Romano, Tom. 1. p. 94, 95.

(*t*) Damnatio & Excommunicatio Friderici. 2. Ibidem.

nication of Frederick II. *&c.* And leaſt this might be thought a raſh and inconſiderate Act of the Pope, he himſelf tells us, That (*u*) *he did diligently deliberate about it, with his Brethren* (the Cardinals he means) *and the Sacred Council*, the General Council of *Lions.*) I know, that *Matthew Paris* ſays, that he publiſh'd that *Excommunication in that Council, not without the* (x) *Horror and Amazement of all who heard it.* But *Platina* tells us, That *it was done by the* (y) *general and concurrent conſent of the Council.* And *Innocent* himſelf expreſly ſays, That it was done (*Friderick* Excommunicate) by the (z) *Council it ſelf*; (and therefore the Major part muſt concur) and if it was not ſo, that Pope was not only fallible, but actually falſe: And it is a conſiderable Obſervation which *Matthew Paris* has, (and therefore I ſhall not omit it) when he tells us—*That ſome did poſitively affirm*, (and he believed it) *that* (*a*) Innocent IV. *did above all things earneſtly deſire to ruin the Emperor* Friderick, (*whom he called the great Dragon*) *that, he being trampled upon, the King of* France, England, *and other Chriſtian Kings*, (*whom he call'd diminutive Kings, and little Serpents*) *affrighted with the ſad Fate of* Friderick, *might more eaſily be kept under, and they and their Prelates ſpoiled of their Goods, and by him plundered.* So that although he, and other Popes did pretend, (as appears by their Bulls) that they depoſed Kings for the Extirpation of Hereſie, the Preſervation of the Catholick

(u) *Cum Fratribus & Sacro Concilio, deliberatione diligenti habitâ* Ib. dictæ Conſtitutionis. §. 6. Bullarij dicti. p. 95. Col. 1. lin. ultimâ.

(x) Non ſine Omnium audientium & Circumſtantium ſtupore & horrore. Matth. Paris in Hen. 3. ad Annum 1245. p. 668. lin. 33.

(y) *Fridericum Omnium Conſenſu Imperio & Regnis privavit.* Platina in vita Innocentij 4. p. 209. Col. 1. Edit. Col. Agripp. 1626.

(z) *Quem* (*Fridericum*) *Concilium Generale Lugdunenſe Caſſaverat & Condemnaverat.* Matth. Paris in Hen. 3. ad An. 1250. p. 773. lin. ultimâ.

(a) *A nonnullis affirmative dicebatur, quod Dominus Papa ſitienter & ſuper Omnia deſiderabat, Fridericum (quem magnum Draconem vocabat) peſſundare, ut ipſo ſuppeditato & Conculcato, Reges Francorum & Angliæ, alióſque Chriſtianitatis Reges, (quos omnes Regulos & Serpentulos eſſe dicebat) facilius, Exemplo dicti Friderici perterritos, Conculcaret, & Bonis ſuis, ac Prælatos eorum, ad Libitum ſpoliaret.* Matth. Paris in Hen. 3. ad dictum Annum 1250. p. 774. lin. 2. &c.

tholick Faith, and Chriſtian Religion; yet 'tis evident to any intelligent and impartial Judge of their Actions, that it was their prodigious ambition and covetouſneſs, their inordinate and erroneous deſire of Dominion, of Rule and Riches, which made them uſurp and exerciſe a power to depoſe Kings and Emperors, which St. *Peter* (from whom they pretend to have it) never had, nor pretended to.

7. Pope *Paul* III. (*b*) Excommunicates, Curſes, Depoſes and Damns *Henry* VIII. of *England*, and all who adhere to him, favour or obey him; abſolves his Subjects from all Oaths of Allegiance; commands them all, under pain of Excommunication, not to obey him, or *any* (c) *Magiſtrate or Officer under him; nor to acknowledge the King or any of his Judges or Officers to be their Superiors.* And further (with ſtrange Impiety and Impudence) he declares King *Henry* and his Complices and Favourers and their Children and Deſcendents to be Infamous, incapable to be Witneſſes, make Wills, or be Heirs to any; Incapable to do any legal Act, and *that in any Cauſe* (d) *of Debt or any other Cauſe Civil or Criminal, none ſhould be bound to anſwer them, and yet they bound to anſwer every body.* And to omit the reſt, (for I ſhall at the end of theſe Obſervations, ſet down the whole Bull) he commands the (*e*) Eccleſiaſticks (Secular and Regular) *to quit the Kingdom, and not to return, till the Perſons Excommunicate, deprived, curſed and damn'd* (the Kin-

an

(*b*) Vide Bullam. 7. Pauli. 3. dat. Romæ 3. Cal. Sept. Anno. 1535. In Bullario Romano. Tom. 1. p. 514. Editionis Romæ 1638.

(c) *Mandantes, ut ab Henrici Regis, ſuorúmque Officialium, Judicum & Magiſtratuum quorumcunque Obedientiâ penitùs & omninò recedant, nec illas in ſuperiores recognoſcant, néque eorum Mandatis Obtemperent.* Dictæ Bullæ. §. 10.

(d) *Et Nulli ipſis, ſed Ipſi aliis ſuper quocunque debito, & negotio, tam Civili, quam Criminali, de jure reſpondere teneantur.* Ibid. §. 11.

(e) *Prælatis quóque & Ceteris perſonis Eccleſiaſticis mandat ſub pœnis in Bulla Contentis, quatenùs de Regno Angliæ diſcedant, nec revertantur, donec dicti Excommunicati, privati, maledicti, & damnati meruerint abſolutionis Beneficium.* Ibid. §. 13. p. 516.

and all his Loyal Subjects he means) *be abſolved from their Cenſures.* This Bull, though fram'd and ready to be publiſh'd, yet the Execution of it was ſuſpended for three years, and then actually publiſhed in the Year 1538. which was the fifth year of Pope *Paul* III. as appears by the Date of it, in the aforeſaid Bullary. And when it was publiſhed, as it was in it ſelf highly Impious, ſo (to *Hen.* VIII and his Loyal Subjects) it was ridiculous; and all the Effect it had was, that it increaſed their hate and contempt of the Antichriſtian pride and folly of its Author. It appeared (what indeed it was) *Brutum fulmen*, and that King had too great a courage and underſtanding, to be frighted with an *Ignis fatuus*, Papal Squibs and Wild-fire, which could neither warm or burn him.

8. Laſtly; as the Popes preceeding *Pius* V. ſo thoſe who followed approved and (ſo far as they were able) put in practiſe that execrable Doctrine of Depoſing Kings. Pope *Gregory* XIII. did immediately ſucceed *Pius* V. and renues and confirms his Bull for depoſing Queen *Elizabeth*, and abſolving her Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance (as is teſtified not only by (*f*) *Cambden*, but by the Romiſh Prieſts themſelves, (the (*g*) Seculars, who ſeem'd moſt moderate) and in proſecution of that damnatory Sentence, the ſaid Pope *Gregory* did conſtitute *Fitz-Gerald* (an *Iriſh* Rebel againſt the Queen) General of all the *Iriſh* Rebels;

(*f*) Cambdens *Elizabeth.* lib. 3. p. 360, 361. ad Annum 1588.

(*g*) See a Book with this Title —— *Important Conſiderations*, &c. written by the Secular Prieſts here in *England*, printed *Anno.* 1601. and reprinted with other Tracts, with this Title —— *A Collection of ſeveral Treatiſes concerning the Reaſons and Occaſion of Penal Laws, &c. London* 1675. In which Collection, pag. 76. the Secular Prieſts tell us, that Pope *Gregory.* 13. did excommunicate Queen *Elizabeth.*

bels; that ſo he and they by Fire and Sword might Execute the Sentence of thoſe two Popes, depoſing that Queen. This is expreſly teſtify'd by *Fitz-Gerald* (*h*) himſelf, in an Edict publiſh'd by him, after he was General, declaring the Juſtice of that *Iriſh* War, which (he ſays) was undertaken for the Catholick Faith, and reſtoring it in *Ireland*. To *Gregory.* XIII. *Sixtus Quintus* immediately ſucceeds, *and confirms the damnatory Sentences of his two Predeceſſors, and* (as he who well knew, tells us) *Excommunicates and* (i) *depoſes the Queen, Abſolves her Subjects from their Oaths of Fidelity, and publiſhed a Croiſado, as againſt Turks and Infidels* (indeed as afterwards evidently appear'd againſt *England* and Queen *Elizabeth*) *and gave* (what he Never had to give) *plenary Indulgence to all who ſhould aſſiſt in that War.* Nor is this all; *Cardinal* Allen (k) *writ a Traiterous and Seditious Book, to Exhort all the* Engliſh *and* Iriſh *Papiſts, to joyn with the* Spaniſh *Forces* (*againſt their Queen and Country*) *under the Prince of* Parma: *and Pope* Sixtus V. *ſends* Allen (*with that Book, and his own Bull*) *into the* Low-Countries, *and there a great number of thoſe Books and Bulls were printed at* Antverpe, *to be ſent into* England. Were it neceſſary, many things now might be ſaid, pertinent to this purpoſe; but (I ſuppoſe) the Inſtances already given, will be ſufficient to convince Intelligent and Impartial Perſons, That Pope *Pius.* V. was neither the firſt nor laſt,

(h) *Gregorius.* 13. *in Ducem ac Generalem hujus belli Capitaneum, Nos Elegit, ut ex ipſius Diplomate conſtat: Quod tanto magis fecit, quia ejus Prædeceſſor Pius.* 5. *Elizabetham hæreſium Patronam Omni Regia Poteſtate privaverat.* Vid. Edictum Illuſtriſſ. D. Jac. Geraldini, de Juſtitia ejus belli, quod in Hibernia pro fide gerit.

'Tis Extant in the Hiſtory of the Iriſh Rebellion. *Lond.* 1680. in the Appendix, p. 8.

(*i*) Cambdens *Elizabeth.* lib. 3. p. 360, 361.

(*k*) Cambden ibid. lib. 3. p. 364.

laſt, who uſurped this Extravagant Power to Depoſe Princes; ſeeing ſeveral of his Predeceſſors and Succeſſors, for above. 600. years, have owned, approved, and (as they had opportunity) put that Power in practiſe: This in General premis'd, I come now to conſider the Bull of *Pius*. V. wherein he damns and depoſeth Queen *Elizabeth*; wherein two things occur very conſiderable;

1. The Ἐπιγραφὴ, or Title prefix'd to the Bull.
2. The Particulars contain'd in it.

For the firſt; the Title prefix'd to the Bull is thus: —*The Damnation of* Elizabeth, *&c.* where, though *Damnation* may ſeem a very hard word (as indeed it is, in the ſenſe they uſe it, as ſhall by and by appear) yet it is not unuſual; but occurs in other Bulls of the like nature: So we find it in the Bull of Pope *Innocent*. IV. wherein he Excommunicates the Emperor *Friderick*. II. For the *Lemma* or *Title* of that Bull is thus—(*l*) *The Damnation & Depoſition of* Friderick. II. So in the Bull of Pope *Paul* III. Excommunicating *Henry*. VIII. the Title prefix'd to it is—(*m*) *The Damnation of* Henry VIII. *and his Favourers*, &c. So that *Pius*. V. *Damning* Queen *Elizabeth*, was not ſingular (though Impious) he had ſome of his Predeceſſors Forms to follow. I ſay, his Predeceſſors; for I do not find that any Biſhops in the World (ſave thoſe of *Rome*) ever uſed ſuch Unchriſtian, and indeed Anti-chriſtian Forms of

Obſerv. 2.

(l) *Damnatio & Depoſitio Friderici.* 2. Vid. Bullarium Romanum, Romæ 1638. Tom. 1. p. 94. Col. 7. Edita erat Bulla iſta Anno 1245.

(m) *Damnatio Hen.* 8, *ejuſque Fautorum, &c.* In Bullario Romano. ibid. p. 514. Col. 2. Edita dicta Bella, Anno 1535. & poſtea 1538.

of Excommunicating and Damning Kings and Emperors. And it is obſervable, and well known to thoſe who diligently read and conſider the Papal Bulls now extant, (of which there is a vaſt (*n*) number) that the Popes of later Ages, when they go about to juſtifie ſome extravagant Act of their uſurped Power; they uſually cite (*o*) the Bulls and Conſtitutions of their Predeceſſors, who had done the like; not for matter *of fact barely*, but to *prove a Right*; that becauſe their Predeceſſors had done ſo formerly, therefore they (who ſucceeded in the ſame Power) might do it too. Now, although to Argue thus, *à Facto ad Jus*, be evidently inconſequent and irrational: (no better than this —*Peter* (*de facto*) deny'd and forſwore his Maſter: *Ergo*, His Succeſſors (*de jure*) may do ſo to.) Yet, if their Principles were true, (as I ſuppoſe they may think them) ſuch Arguing would be more concluding. For, Pope *Leo.* X. expreſly (*p*) affirms, and publickly declares, in one of their General Councils, that it is more clear than light it ſelf; *That None of his Predeceſſors, Popes of* Rome, *Did ever Err, in any of their Canons or Conſtitutions.* Now if this were true, (as it is evidently falſe, and his Aſſerting it, an Argument not only of his Fallibility, but of his great Error and Folly) *That none of his Predeceſſors ever Err'd*, then they might with more Security follow them; for certainly, it can be no great fault or danger to follow an unerring Guide. Eſpecially if it be true which they tell us.

For 1. In their Laws and Canons, approved by their Supream Authority, and retained in publick uſe

(*n*) Vid. *Bullarium Romanum* Lugduni. 1655. in.4. Tomis in Folio, & Eclogen Bullarum & motu propriorum Pii.4. &c. Lugduni. 1582. 8°. & *Novam Collectionem*, &c. Eman. Roder. Turnoni. 1609. fol. where in that one Volume you have above. 500. Bulls, with the Names of. 46. Popes, who publiſhed them.

(*o*) Vid. Conſtitut. 22 Julij Papæ. 2. In Bullario Romano Tom. 1. p. 378. & Conſtitut. 81. Gregorij. 13. In dicto Bullario Tom. 2. p. 348. vide Extravag. Communes, l. 5. Tit. 9. cap. Unigenitus 2.

(p) *Docuiſſemus eum* (*Lutherum*) *Luce clarius, Sanctos Rom. Pontifices Prædeceſſores noſtros, in ſuis Canonibus ſeu Conſtitutionibus Nunquam Erraſſe.* Vide Bullam Apoſtolicam Leonis 10. contra Errores Lutheri, & ſequacium. Dat: Romæ 17 Cal. Julij, An. 1520. & Pontificatus ſui, 8°. Apud Pet. Crab. Conc. Tom. 3. p. 715. &c. And his Predeceſſor, *Julius.* 2. ſays as much for the Church of *Rome*, —— *S. Sancta Eccleſia Romana, Magiſtra fidei, Omnium Errorum Expers, unica, immaculata*, &c. Conſtitutio. 27. Julij. 2. data Anno. 1512. In Bullario Romano Tom. 1. p. 384.

uſe in their Church, we are told, (q) *That all their Papal Sanctions are ſo to be received, as if the Divine Voice of Peter himſelf had Confirmed them:* This (as *Gratian* there tells us) *was Pope* Agatho's *Sentence, & is Received into the Body of their Canon Law, Reviſed, Corrected, and Purged from all things Contrary to Catholick Verity:* So (r) *Gregory* XIII. ſays, and confirms it. Whence it evidently follows; that (in Pope *Gregory*'s Judgment) This Sentence of *Agatho* is not repugnant to *Catholick Verity:* And in the ſame place it is farther declared for Law, (Pope *Stephen*.I. is cited as Author of that Sentence) *That,* (ſ) *Whatever the Church of* Rome *does Ordain or Conſtitute, it is* (*without all Contradiction*) *perpetually to be Obſerved.*

2. Though this be (beyond all truth and reaſon) highly erroneous; yet the Jeſuits (of late) have gone much higher, and in their Claromont Colledge at *Paris*, publickly (t) maintain'd theſe two Poſitions. 1. *That our Bleſſed Saviour left* Peter *and his Succeſſors, the ſame Infallibility, he himſelf had, ſo oft as they ſpoke* è Cathedra. 2. *That* (*even out of a General Council*) *He is the Infallible Judge in Controverſies of Faith, both in Queſtions of Right and Fact.* This (as to the main of it, though Erroneous and Impious) is maintain'd by others, as well as Jeſuits. *F. Gregory de Rives*, a Capuchin Prieſt, tells us (and his Book is approved by the General, and ſeveral others of his Order, and by Father *D. Roquet*, a Dominican, and Doctor of Divinity, &c.) (u) *That as the Authority of Chriſt* (*our bleſſed Saviour*) *if he were now on Earth, were*

(q) *Sic Omnes Apoſtolicæ Sedis Sanctiones accipiendæ ſunt, tanquam Ipſius Divini Petri voce Firmatæ ſint.* Can. ſic Omnes 2. diſt. 19. & Ibid. Can. 3. 4. &c.

(r) Vide Bullam Greg. 13. datam Romæ. 1. Jul. 1580. Jur. Can. præfixam.

(ſ) *Quicquid Statuit, Quicquid Ordinat Romana Eccleſia, Ab Omnibus perpetuo & Irrefragabiliter eſt Obſervandum.* Ibid. Can. Enimvero. 4. Diſt. 19

(t) *Chriſtum ita Caput Eccleſiæ Agnoſcimus, ut illius regimen, dum in Cœlos abiit, primum Petro, dein ſucceſſoribus commiſerit, & eandem quam habebat Ipſe infallibilitatem, conceſſerit, quoties ex Cathedrâ loqueretur. Datur, ergo, in Eccleſ. Rom. Controverſiarum fidei Judex Infallibilis, etiam Extra Concilium generale, tum in Quæſtionibus Juris & Facti.* Vid. Expoſit. Theſeos. in Coll. Claromontano propoſitæ. 12. Dec. 1661.

(u) *Si Chriſti Authoritas non penderet à Concilio, ſi adhuc in terris viveret, ſed Omni Concilio Major eſſet. Eâdem Ratione, & Pontificis Authoritas, quæ ipſius Chriſti Vicaria eſt, Concilio ſuperior eſt.---- Privilegium Infallibilis veritatis, non Concilio, ſed Pontifici à Chriſto Collatum eſt. Luc. 22. 32.* Gr. de Rives Epitome Concil. in Principio. prælud. 5.

greater than all Councils, ſo by the Same Reaſon, the Authority of the Pope (who is Chriſt's Vicar) is greater than all Councils too. That the Priviledge of Infallibility was given to the Pope, not to Councils; and then Concludes, That the (x) Church of Rome (he means the Pope) is Judge of Controverſies, and all her Deſinitions and Determinations are De Fide. Thus De Rives. And three or four years before him, Lud. Bail (a Pariſian Doctor and Propenitentiary) expreſly affirms, That the (y) Word of God is threefold. 1. His written Word, in Scripture. 2. His unwritten Word, in the Traditions of the Church. 3. The Word Declared or Explain'd; when doubtful paſſages in Scripture or Tradition are explain'd, and their meaning determin'd by the Pope, whether in, or out of Councils; and this (he ſays) is the moſt approved way, in which men acquieſce, and think they need look no further. And hence he Infers, That ſeeing this is ſo; we (z) ought not to be affraid to follow the Pope's Guidance in Doctrines of Faith and Manners, but acquieſce in his Judgment, and ſubmit all our writings to be Corrected by him. I neither will nor need Cite any more Authorities, to prove the aforeſaid Particulars; That Their Popes may Damn and Depoſe Kings and Emperors (eſpecially if they be Hereticks) and think they have (as Chriſt's Vicars) a juſt Prerogative and Power to do it. Sure I am, that theſe Poſitions (though Erroneous and Impious) are generally maintain'd by the Jeſuits, Canoniſts, (a) Schoolmen, and their Followers (which are very many) receiv'd into the Body of their Canon Law of their beſt, and (as they themſelves ſay) their moſt Correct Editions, and

(x) *Eccleſia Romana eſt Judex Controverſiarum in Rebus Fidei, & Ipſius Determinationes Sunt De Fide.* Ibid. Prælud. 9. Edit. Lugd. Anno. 1663.

(y) *Verbum Dei, vel eſt Scriptum in Scripturis: vel non ſcriptum, Traditiones: vel Explicatum, cum dubia in verbo Scripto aut Tradito Explicantur. Quod ſit Præſertim per Papam, ſive Extra Concilia, ſeu in Conciliis. Iſque modus ultimus Magis probatus eſt, & Majori ſuavitate ei Plures acquieſcunt, ut nihil ulterius Contendendum exiſtiment.* Lud. Bail in Prin: Apparatus ad ſummam Conc. De triplici verbo Dei.

(z) *Quæ cum ita ſint, nec Nos debemus vereri ejus ductum ſequi, In Doctrinâ Fidei & Morum, ejus Judicio Nos ſiſtere, & ſcripta Omnia corrigenda ſubmittere.* Idem in Calce præfationis ad Lectorem, Tom. 1. præfixam.

(a) Vide Aquinatem. 2. 2. Quæſt. 11. Art. 3. *Utrum Hæretici ſint tollerandi? negat.* & ibid. Quæſt. 12. Art. 2. *Utrum Princeps propter Apoſtaſiam à fide, amittat Dominium in Subditos, ita quod ei obedire non Tenentur?* He affirms it, and ſays--- *Ejus Subditi à Dominio ejus & Juramento Fidelitatis (ſi ſit Excommunicatus) Ipſo facto liberantur.*

and approved, and (when they had opportunity) practis'd by (their Supream Powers) their Popes and General Councils. I would not be miſtaken; I do not ſay that all who now do, or for this Six hundred years laſt paſt, have liv'd in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, either do, or did approve ſuch Papal Poſitions or Practices. I know the *Sorbon* and *Univerſity of Paris*, and many in other Countries, have publickly Declared their diſbelief and diſlike of them; Eſpecially in (*b*) *Germany*, in the time of *Hen.* III. *Hen.* IV. *Friderick* II. *&c.* not only private Perſons, but ſome Synods declared the Papal Excommunications and Depoſitions of their Emperors, not only Injuſt and Impious, but Antichriſtian. I grant alſo, That *Father Caron* in his *Remonſtrantiâ Hibernorum* (if ſome have rightly told the Number) has cited Two hundred and fifty Popiſh Authors, who deny the Popes Power to depoſe Kings: And though I know that many of his Citations are Impertinent; yet I ſhall neither deny nor doubt, but that there are many thouſand honeſt Papiſts in the outward Communion of the Church of *Rome*, who diſlike this Doctrine. But this will neither Juſtifie or Excuſe the Church of *Rome*, ſo long as her Governing and Ruling part publickly approves and maintains it. For, 1. Father (*c*) *Caron* himſelf tells us, that (notwithſtanding his Book, and all his Authorities for Loyalty to Kings) *The Divines of Lovane*, The *Pope's Nuncio*, the Cardinals, four or five Popes, (*Paulus.* V. *Pius.* V. *Alexander.* VII. *Innocentius.* X. (he might eaſily have reckon'd many more)

(*b*) Vid. Johan. Aventinum Annal: Bojorum. Lib. 5. 6. 7. Carol. Sigonium de Regno Italiæ. Matth. Pariſ. &c. Ad An. 1078. p. 10. 11. & p. 13. lin. 1. & p. 668. lin. 30. & 773. lin. 49. & p. 774. lin. 1. 2. & p. 875. where *R. Groſthead* (for his Tyrannical Uſurpations) calls the Pope Antichriſt.

(*c*) Remonſtrant: Hibernorum, part. 1. Cap. 3. &c.

more) did condemn his Doctrine, *The Inquiſitors damn'd his Book*, and *his Superiors Excommunicate him.* 2. It is confeſſed, That the Supream Infallible Power of their Church, reſides either in the Pope, or Council, or both together; And 'tis alſo certain, That their Popes, in their approved, and (in (*d*) publick uſe) received Canon Law, in their Authentick Bulls, (publiſh'd by themſelves) in their General Councils (and (*e*) with their Conſent) have approved, and (for this Six hundred years laſt paſt) many times practis'd this Doctrine of Depoſing Kings; nor has the Church of *Rome* (I mean the Governing and Ruling part of it) by any Publick Act or Declaration diſown'd or cenſur'd it, as doubtleſs ſhe would, had ſhe indeed diſliked it. *Quæ non prohibet, cum poſſit, jubet.* If any man think otherwiſe, and can really ſhew me, that their Popes and General Councils have not formerly approved, or ſince have diſown'd and diſapprov'd this Doctrine: I ſhall willingly acknowledge my miſtake, and be thankful to him for a Civility, which (at preſent) I really believe I ſhall never receive. However, *Grata ſupervenient quæ non ſperantur.*

3. Seing it is Evident that Pope *Pius.* V. (and his Predeceſſors in the like Caſes) calls the Anathema and Curſe contain'd in this Bull, *The Damnation of Q. Elizabeth*; The next Query will be, What that hard word ſignifies, and what they mean by it, in their Bulls? For the Solution of which doubt, and Satisfaction to the Query: 1. I take it to be certain and confeſs'd; That the word *Damnum* (from whence

(d) *Volentes (verba ſunt Gregorij Papæ. 9.) ut hac Tantum Compilatione Univerſi utantur, & in Judiciis & Scholis, &c.* Bulla Greg. 9. Decretal. præfixa.

(*e*) Innocent. 4. Excommunicates *Friderick.* 2. in the General Council at *Lions, Omnium Conſenſu, &c.* Platina in vita Innocent. 4. And Pope *Innocent* himſelf ſaid conſtantly that the Council of *Lions* Excommunicated and Depoſed that Emperor. Matth. Paris in Hen. 3. Ad Ann. 1250. p. 773. lin. 58. 59. And Pope *Paſch.* 2. tells us, That he Excommunicated the Emperor *Hen.* 4. *Judicio Totius Eccleſiæ.* Carol. Sigonius de Regno Italiæ. l. 9. p. 237. lin. 18. *Obſerv.* 3.

whence *Damnation* comes) ſignifies a (*f*) *diminution*, or (*g*) *loſs of ſome good things*, had and enjoyed before, or of a right to future good things, and then *Damnation* (as to our preſent Caſe) will be a judicial ſentence, which (by way of puniſhment) impoſes ſuch loſs and diminution. 2. As the *Damnum* or loſs may be either of Temporal things here (as loſs of Honours, Liberty, Lands or Life) or of Spiritual and Eternal things, (as Heaven and Salvation) hereafter; ſo the *Damnation* alſo (according to the Nature of the ſentence, and the miſchief intended by it) may be Temporal or Eternal, or both; if it penally inflict the loſs both of Goods Temporal and Eternal. 3. I ſay then (and I hope to make it evident) that the miſchief intended by this Papal Bull, and Excommunication (ſo far as the malice and injuſtice of an Uſurped Power could) endeavoured to be brought upon that good Queen, was not only *Temporal*, but alſo *Spiritual and Eternal*. This the word *Damnation*, in the Ἐπιγραφὴ, or Title of the Bull, (in their Popiſh Conſtruction) intends and ſignifies. For the Temporal miſchiefs intended to be brought upon that Good Queen, there is no queſtion; they are all particularly named in the Bull it ſelf, as we ſhall ſee anon. For the Spiritual, that is, a ſecluſion out of Heaven and Happineſs, and Eternal Damnation of Body and Soul; that theſe alſo were the intended and deſigned Effects of this Impious Bull and Excommunication, is now to be proved. And here it is to be Conſidered,

1. That

(f) *Damnum à demendo, quia damnum eſt Rei diminutio unde Damna Lunæ, apud Gellium.* Noct. Atticarum lib. 20. Cap. 8. And *Varro*; *Damnum à demptione* lib. 4. de Legibus. So *Iſiodore* lib. 5. Orig. Cap. 22.

(*g*) *Damnum eſt amiſſio eorum quæ habueras.* Quinctilianus Declamat. 120. And a good Lawyer tells me, that —*Damnare*; *eſt rem ſine remedio ſublevandi tormentis ſeu Ignominiæ ſententialiter deputare.* Panormitan. in Cap. Damnamus. in. 2. Notab. de ſummâ Trinit. & fide Catholicâ.

1. That they conſtantly ſay, and (having ſtrong Deluſion) poſſibly may believe it; That Hereticks (and ſuch the Queen is declared to be in the Bull) dying Excommunicate, (as that Queen did, and all true Proteſtants do) are *Eternally Damn'd.* For, 1. A very great (*h*) *Canoniſt* of our own Nation, (while Popiſh Superſtition unhappily prevail'd here) tells us, *That every Excommunicate Perſon is a Member of the Devil.* And for farther proof of this, he Cites (*i*) *Gratian* and their Canon Law, (and he might have Cited other as pertinent places in *Gratian*) who tells us, in another Canon (*k*), *That Excommunication is a Damnation to Eternal Death.* And *John Semeca* the Gloſſator gives us their meaning of it; *That it is certainly true, when the* (l) *Perſon Excommunicate is incorrigible, and contemns the Excommunication,* (as for my part I really do contemn all their Excommunications, as *Bruta fulmina*, which neither do, nor can hurt any honeſt Proteſtant) ſo that by their Injuſt Law, and moſt uncharitable Divinity, not only Queen *Elizabeth*, but all Proteſtants (who are every Year Excommunicated by the Pope, in their *Bulla* (*m*) *Cœnæ Domini*) are *Eternally damned*, and that *è Cathedra.* A Sentence Erroneous and Impious; and (though it be the Popes, whom they miſcall *Infallible*) inconſiſtent with Truth, or Chriſtian Charity.

2. But we have (both for Learning and Authority) a far greater Author than *Lindwood* or *Gratian*, and (in our days) long after them; I mean Cardinal *Baronius*; who tells us—

(h) *Excommunicatus eſt Membrum Diaboli.* Lindewood ad Cap. *Seculi Principes.* verbo. Reconciliationis. De Immunit. Eccleſiæ.

(*i*) Gratian. Can. Omnis Chriſtianus. 32. Cauſ. 11. Quæſt. 3.

(k) *Excommunicatio eſt Æternæ Mortis Damnatio.* Idem Gratian. Can. Nemo. 41. Cauſ. 11. Quæſt. 3.

(l) *Eſt Perpetua Damnatio cum ab Excommunicato contemnitur.* Gloſſ. ad dictum Can. verbo mortis.

(*m*) This *Bulla Cœnæ* often (with ſome alterations) occurs in *Bullario Romano.* vid. Conſtit. 25. Julii. 2. Tom. 1. pag. 382. Edit. Romæ. 1638. & Conſtit. 63. Pauli. 5. Tom. 3. p. 83. ubi reliqua, hujus Bullæ Exemplaria dicto Bullario comprehenſa, indicantur.

(*n*) *That*

(n) *That Pope* Gregory. VII. *did not only depoſe the Emperor* Hen. IV. *but Excommunicate, and Decree him to be Eternally Damn'd.* And for this he (o) Cites Pope *Gregory*'s own Epiſtles, who ſurely beſt knew his own mind, and the meaning of his own Decree.

3. But we have greater Authors and Authority for this, than *Baronius*; for Pope *Paſchal.* II. tells us, (p) *That he had Excommunicated the Emperor* Hen. IV. *in a Council*; and adds, *That by the Judgment of the whole Church, he lay bound under An Eternal Anathema.* And after this Pope *Paul.* III. (q) *Damns* (thats the word) *and Excommunicates our King* Hen. VIII. *and all his Favourers and Adherents; And we ſmite them* (ſaith he) *with the Sword of an Anathema, Malediction, and Eternal Damnation.* In the Year 1459. *Pius.* II. (*with the Unanimous Conſent of his Council, at* Mantua, *Excommunicates and Damns all thoſe* (*even* (r) *Kings and Emperors*) *who ſhall Appeal from the Pope to a General Council, and that they ſhall be puniſh'd as* (ſ) *Traytors and Hereticks.* Pope *Julius.* II. afterwards confirms this Conſtitution of his Predeceſſor, as to all the Puniſhments contain'd in it; Excommunicates and Curſes all Perſons, Eccleſiaſtical and Secular, of what Dignity ſoever (though Kings) who ſhall offend againſt that Conſtitution; and *Decrees that they ſhall have* (t) *their Portion and Damnation with* Dathan *and* Abiron. The Damnation then intended and threatned in this Impious Bull of *Pius* V. (as in other Papal Bulls of the like nature) is not only ſome *Temporal loſs and damage* (though that

(n) *Non modo deponi, ſed etiam Excommunicari, & in Æternâ Examine Damnari Decrevit.* Baronius Annal. Tom. 8. ad An. Chriſti. 593. num. 86.

(o) Gregor. 7. lib. 4. Epiſt. 2. & 23. & lib. 8. Epiſt. 21.

(p) *Henricum. 4. primum à Gregorio Papâ, dein ab Urbano, Poſtremo à Nobis, Judicio Totius Eccleſiæ, Perpetuo Anathemate Obligatus eſt.* Car. Sigonius de Regno Italiæ. lib. 9. pag. 237.

(q) *Henricum, Ejúſq; fautores, Adhærentes, &c. Excommunicatos Decernimus, eoſque Anathematis, Maledictionis, & Æternæ Damnationis mucrone percutimus.* In Bulla Damnationis Hen. 8. Dat. Romæ. Cal. Sept. Ann. 1535.

(r) *Si Imperiali, Regali, aut Pontificali Dignitate præfulgeant.* §. 3. dictæ Bullæ.

(ſ) *Pœnis quæ Læſæ Majeſtatis & Hæreticæ pravitatis reis Imponuntur.* Ibidem.

(t) *Decernentes eos pro Schiſmaticis, & de Catholicâ fide male ſentientibus, cum Dathan & Abiron partem & Damnationem habere:* Conſtit. 22. Pii. 2. §. 6. vid. P. Crab. Concil. Tom. 3. p. 690. Col. 2. & ibi formam —ſub pœnâ Maledictionis Æternæ.

that alſo be included and expreſſed) but the *Eternal Damnation of Body and Soul.* Which further appears by that Famous (or indeed Infamous, Erroneous and Ridiculous) Conſtitution of *Boniface* VIII. wherein having ſaid, *That there is but one Catholick Church, out of which, there is no Salvation; and that our Bleſſed Saviour made* Peter *and his Succeſſors his Vicarij, Vice-Gerents, and Heads of that Church;* he adds, *That* (u) *whoever are not of that Church, and in Subjection and Obedient to the Pope, can have no Salvation.* And *Pius.* V. in this very Bull, expreſly ſays the ſame. For, 1. He ſays, *That out of the Apoſtolick* (x) *Church* (he means evidently his own Roman Church) *there is no Salvation.* 2. *He Declares Queen* Elizabeth *an* (y) *Heretick, that ſhe and all her Adherents had Incurr'd an Anathema and Malediction, were Excommunicate, and cut off from the Body of Chriſt.* So that Queen *Elizabeth*, and all her Loyal Proteſtant Subjects, who never were, nor could be, (as without great Error and Impiety they could not) ſubject to the Pope, nor Members of his Apoſtolical Church, are (by this Bull) *Eternally Damn'd.*

4. But this is not all; for we have greater Evidence, that by the word *Damnation* in their Bulls, wherein all Hereticks, (Proteſtants you may be ſure, who without Truth or Charity, they call ſo) are Curs'd and Excommunicated, they do and muſt mean *Eternal Damnation.* For, 1. Pope *Leo.* X. in the *Lateran* (z) Council, (which with them is General and Oecumenial) innovates and eſtabiſheth (with the Approbation and Conſent of that Council)

(u) *Porro ſubeſſe Rom. Pontifici Omni humanæ Creaturæ declaramus, dicimus, definimus, & pronunciamus Omnino eſſe de Neceſſitate Salutis.* Conſtit. Bonifacii. 8. dat. Romæ. Ann. 1301. Pont. Ann. 8. Cap. unam ſanctam. 1. De Major. & Obed. Extrav. Communes.

(x) *Eccleſia Apoſtolica, extra quam nulla eſt Salus.* In Prin. Bullæ. Pii. 5.

(y) *Declaramus Elizabetham Hæreticam eique Adhærentes Anathematis ſententiam incurriſſe, eſſeque a Chriſti Corporis Unitate Præciſos.* Ibid. §. 3.

(z) *Cum de neceſſitate Salutis ſit, Omnes Chriſti fideles Romano Pontifici ſubeſſe, prout Divinæ Scripturæ & Sanctorum Patrum Teſtimonio edocemur, & Conſtitutione Bonifacii Papæ. 8. quæ incipit Unam Sanctam, declaratur.* ——*Conſtitutionem Ipſam Sacro præſenti Concilio Approbante Innovamus, & Approbamus.* Conc. Lateran. ſub Leone. 10. Seſſ. 10. apud P. Crab. Conc. Tom. 3. p. 697. Col. 1.

Council) the aforeſaid Doctrine and Conſtitution of Pope *Boniface.* VIII. 2. The *Trent* Council does ſo too, and abſolutely Anathematizes and Damns all thoſe who do not believe their whole new Creed; (in which there is not one true Article, but all Erroneous, many Superſtitious and Impious) and tells us, *It is the Catholick* (a) *Faith, without the belief of which, no man can be ſaved, and ſwear firmly to believe it to their laſt breath, and Anathematize all who do not.* And (which is further very conſiderable and pertinent to confirm what is aboveſaid) they do in that Oath promiſe, vow, and ſwear to receive and imbrace (*b*) *All Things delivered, defined, and declared in their General Councils, and All* (*c*) *the Conſtitutions of their Church*; For theſe Particulars are parts of that new Creed, to the Belief and Profeſſion of which they are ſworn. And the *Trent* Council it ſelf (as well as the Pope in that Creed) (*d*) requires that they make ſuch a Profeſſion. Whence it evidently follows, that all their Biſhops, all Regulars of what Order ſoever, who are provided of Monaſteries, Religious Houſes, &c. All *Canons* and *Dignitaries* in their Church, all who have any *Cure of Souls*, and all *who profeſs and teach* any of the Liberal Arts, *&c.* (for all theſe are required to take that Oath) are ſworn to *receive, believe*, and *profeſs* all the *Definitions* of the *Lateran Council* under *Leo.* X. and the *Conſtitution* of Pope *Boniface.* VIII. which denounces Damnation to all thoſe who ſubmit not to the Pope, and imbrace not their Popiſh Religion; and hence it further, and as evidently follows, that not only

(a) *Contraria Omnia & Hæreſes, ab Eccleſia Damnatas & Anathematizatas Ego pariter Anathematizo. Hanc veram Catholicam fidem, Extra quam Nemo Salvus eſſe Poteſt, quam veraciter teneo, & ad Extremum vitæ Spiritum, Conſtantiſſimè retinere, ſpondeo, voveo, juro.* Conc. Trident. Seſſ. 24. De Reformat. in Calce Cap. 12. p. 452. Edit. Antverp. 1633.

(b) *Omnia à Concilijs Oecumenicis tradita, definita, & Declarata, Indubitanter recipio, & profiteor.* Ibid. p. 452.

(c) *Apoſtolicas Traditiones, reliquaſque Ejuſdem Eccleſiæ Conſtitutiones firmiſſimè admitto & amplector.* Ibid. p. 451.

(d) Conc. Trident. Seſſ. 24. De Reformat. cap. 12. *Proviſi de Beneficiis*, &c. *Teneantur fidei publicam facere profeſſionem in Rom. Eccleſiæ Obedientiâ ſe Permanſuros ſpondeant ac Jurent.* p. 432. dictæ Editionis. And that we may know that the Faith they are to profeſs and ſwear to, is the Creed of *Pius.* V. in the afore-named Edition of the Council of *Trent*, at *Antverp.* 1633. *Pius.* 5. his Creed, and the *Forma Juramenti Profeſſionis Fidei*, is placed immediately after that 12. Cap. Seſſ. 24. De Reformat. pag. 450.

only Queen *Elizabeth*, but all good Proteſtants then, and ever ſince, (who neither did, nor without great Error and Impiety, could ſo ſubmit to their Popes, or believe their New Creed) are, by their Papal and uncharitable Divinity, *Eternally Damn'd.* So that it is not only ſome Temporal miſchief or loſs, but the *Eternal Damnation of Body and Soul,* which is threatned, and Declared to be the Effect and Inevitable Conſequence of this againſt Queen *Elizabeth,* and ſuch other Excommunications of thoſe whom they call Hereticks.

Obſerv. 4. 4 In the beginning of this Impious Bull, we are told by the Pope, *That our Bleſſed Saviour committed the Government of His Church (with all plenitude and fulneſs of Power) to* Peter *and his Succeſſors.* And that we might know, how great the Power was over all Kings and Kingdoms, he miſerably miſapplies a Text in (e) *Jeremy*; and ſays—(f) *That our bleſſed Saviour did Conſtitute* Peter *alone a Prince, over All Nations, and All Kingdoms, to Pull up, and Throw down, to Diſſipate and Deſtroy, to Plant and Build* (in Ordine ad Spiritualia) *in Order to the Salvation of his Faithful People*; ſo that (if we may believe this Infallible Expoſitor) the ſame Power which God gave *Jeremy over all Nations and Kingdoms, to pull up and deſtroy them*; the very ſame did our bleſſed Saviour give to *Peter* and his Succeſſors. Nor is *Pius.* V. the only Pope who makes uſe of that Text to prove their extravagant Papal Power over Kings: Pope *Alexander.* III. having told ſome of his Brethren, how *the* (g) *Emperor held*

(e) Jer. 1. 10.

(f) *Petro & Succeſſoribus, Eccleſiam, in plenitudine Poteſtatis gubernandam tradidit. Hunc unum ſuper Omnes Gentes, & Omnia Regna Principem Conſtituit, qui Evellat, Deſtruat, Diſſipet, Diſperdat, plantet & ædificet; ut fideles Salvos exhibeat Salvatori.*

(g) *Cum Aſcenderemus Palfredum noſtrum, Fridericus Imp. Stapham tenuit.* &c. Conſtit. 8. Alexand. 3. In Bullario Rom. Tom. 1. p. 65. Col. 2.

held his Stirrup when he mounted his Palfrey; In his next Conſtitution, (having ſaid, That the Diligence of the Biſhops and Paſtors was neceſſary to pull up, and cut off Hereticks, and wicked men in the Church) he Cites the place of *Jeremy* to prove it; and ſays, *That the Power over Nations and Kingdoms, to pull up, caſt down, and deſtroy, was Given to* Jeremy (*h*), *and In Him, to the Evangelical Prieſt, to* Peter *and his Succeſſors*, as he there expreſly explains it. And Pope *Paul.* III. tells us; —(*i*) *That he was Vicar of Chriſt, our bleſſed Saviour, and plac'd in the Throne of Juſtice Above All Kings in the whole World, According to the Prophecy of* Jeremy; And then Cites the words of *Jeremy* before mention'd. And (to omit others) Pope *Boniface.* VIII. Cites the ſame Text (though to as little purpoſe) to the ſame end; to prove *the* (k) *Popes power above Kings*, ſo as to puniſh and depoſe them. And before him *Innocent.* III. in his wild and irrational Epiſtle to the Emperor of *Conſtantinople* (l), Cites the ſame Text of *Jeremy*, and another (*Gen.*1.16.) more impertinent (if that be poſſible) to prove the vaſt Power of Popes above all (*m*) Kings and Emperors. By all which, Papal Bulls and Conſtitutions (as by many others of the like nature) it may evidently appear, that they challenge a Power to depoſe Kings, and that they bring the Text of *Jeremy* as a ground and proof of it.

But although their Popes brag, *That they have* (n) *all Laws in the Archives of their own breaſts*, and that they are Supream and Infallible Judges in all

(h) *Deus Jeremiam, & in illo Evangelicum Sacerdotem inſtruxit dicens; Ecce Conſtitui Te ſuper Gentes & Regna, ut Evellas, deſtruas, diſperdas, &c. quæ Poteſtas imminet in Romano Antiſtite, qui à Chriſto, ut ſit Caput Eccleſiæ, accepit.* Ibid. Conſtit. 9. p. 65. Col. 2.

(i) *Ejus Vices gerentes in terris, & in Sede Juſtitiæ Conſtituti, Juxta Jeremiæ Vaticinium, &c. ſuper Omnes Reges Univerſæ Terræ.* In Bullâ Damnationis Hen. 8. data Rom. 1535. & 1538.

(k) *Spiritualis Poteſtas terrenam judicare debet, ſi bona non fuerit: ſic Verificatur Vaticinium Jeremiæ, Conſtitui Te ſuper Gentes*, &c. Cap. unam Sanctam. 1. de major. & Obed. Extrav. Communes.

(*l*) Cap. Solicit. 6. Extra. De Major. & Obedientia.

(m) *Deus Papam Totius Orbis præcipuum obtinere voluit Magiſtratum.* Bonif. 8. in Bulla. 6. Decretalium præfixa.

(*n*) Dictum Bonif. 8. Cap. *Licet Romanus.* De Conſtitut. in. 6. *Romanus Pontifex jura Omnia in Scrinio pectoris ſui cenſetur habere.*

Controverſies of Faith; yet their whole Diſcourſe and Deductions from the Text of the Prophet *Jeremy*, is inconſequent, and indeed ridiculous, and no way concerns either *Peter*, or any of his pretended Succeſſors. For,

1. This Power which God gave to *Jeremy*, was Perſonal, to himſelf only, not hereditary or after his death to be continued to any Succeſſor; much leſs to *Peter*, who came above Six hundred years after. That the Popes of this or former Ages, were Succeſſors to *Peter*, both the Popes themſelves, and Popiſh Authors univerſally affirm; but (as yet) I have found none (except the Pope and ſome few of his Party) who ſay that either *Peter*, or any Pope, was Succeſſor to *Jeremy*. It's true, Pope *Alexander*. III. (in the Place quoted a little before) ſays; *That that Power over Nations and Kingdoms, to pull up, diſſipate, and deſtroy*, &c. *was* (*by God*) *given to* Jeremy, *and in Him to* Peter. So that (by this wild Suppoſition) *Peter* ſucceeded into that Power, which before him, *Jeremy* had. But (notwithſtanding his Infallibility) this is *gratis dictum* without any ſhadow or pretence of Reaſon: For he who ſucceeds into a Right which another poſſeſs'd before him, muſt do it either, 1. *Per generationem & Jure Sanguinis*; as a Son ſucceeds his Father, or the next Heir, *In jus defuncti*: and that *Peter*, or any Pope did this way ſucceed *Jeremy*, as none (with any reaſon) can, I ſuppoſe none will ſay. 2. *Per Conſecrationem & Jure Ordinis*; ſo one Biſhop ſucceeds another

in

in the ſame Biſhoprick. Neither could *Peter* ſucceed *Jeremy* this way; for *Jeremy* was never Biſhop of *Rome*, or any other place; and then 'tis impoſſible that they ſhould ſucceed him in a Place he never had, and be Succeſſor to one who never was their Predeceſſor. 3. A man may be ſaid to ſucceed another, who has a new Commiſſion given him, to Execute an Office, which (though intermitted) ſome had long before him. So ſuppoſe the King ſhould give one a Commiſſion to be High Conſtable of *England*, after the Place had been long void; he who had ſuch Commiſſion, may be ſaid to ſucceed him, who had that Office laſt, though One or Two hundred years before. Now if the Pope (or any for him) can ſhew, that our bleſſed Saviour gave *Peter* the ſame Commiſſion, which God gave *Jeremy*, and ſet him over Nations and Kingdoms, to pull up, diſſipate, and deſtroy, *&c.* (as Pope *Pius.* V. expreſly ſays (o) he did, in this His Impious Bull againſt Q. *Elizabeth*) then I will Confeſs, that in this Senſe *Peter* may be called *Jeremy*'s Succeſſor. But that our bleſſed Saviour gave *Peter* any ſuch Commiſſion (though the Pope ſay it) is abſolutely untrue; not only without any foundation or ground of Reaſon for it in Scripture, (and nothing elſe can prove it) but point blank againſt it. *As our Saviour's Kingdom was not of this World*, no Temporal Power or Dominion; ſo he neither exercis'd any ſuch Power himſelf, nor gave *Peter* or his Apoſtles, (who, all of them had

(o) *Regnans in Excelſis* (i.e. *Chriſtus*) *Eccleſiam ſoli Petro & Succeſſoribus tradidit Gubernandam.* And then it immediately follows —— *Hunc Unum* (*Petrum ſcilicet*) *ſuper Omnes Gentes, & Omnia Regna Principem Conſtituit, qui evellat, deſtruat, diſſipet, diſperdat, plantet, &c.* Bulla dicta in Principio.

had Equal Power with *Peter*), any such (*p*) *Temporal Power over Nations and Kingdoms, to pull up, destroy, and dissipate, &c.* All the Power they had was *Spiritual*; they could punish no man (unless miraculously, which the Pope pretends not to) *in his person*, by loss of *Life*, or *Liberty* (by Imprisonment) nor *in his purse*, by imposing and exacting Pecuniary Mulcts; as has been, and might be farther demonstrated, were it now my business: Only (by the way) I crave leave to observe, That Pope *Pius* in this Bull, makes that Commission, which he says, our blessed Saviour gave *Peter*, far larger than that which God gave *Jeremy*. For he tells us, 1. *That our blessed Saviour did* (q) *Constitute* Peter *a Prince, to pull up, and destroy, &c.* but there is no such thing in *Jeremy*'s Commission. 2. That *Peter* was Constituted a Prince *over* (r) *All Nations, and All Kingdoms*; but *Jeremy* had not such Universal Power, as is evident from the (*s*) Text. But to make this further appear, it is to be Consider'd,

2. That *Jeremy* was a Priest, and a Prophet; so that if *Peter* and his Successors succeeded him, it must be in one of those two Capacities. But, 1. 'Tis certain, that neither *Peter*, nor any Christian Bishop did, or could succeed him, as a Priest; he being a Priest of *Aaron*'s Order, which absolutely ceased at our Saviour's death. 2. Nor did he succeed *Jeremy* as to his Prophetical Office. 1. Because that was, Extraordinary, Temporary, and Expired with his Person.

(*p*) Pope *Nicol.* 1. (and he as Infallible as any of his Successors) tells us; That *Ecclesia non habet Gladium nisi Spiritualem, qui non occidit, sed vivificat.* Luitprandus in vita, Nicol. 1. Cap. 107. But he lived above 800. years since, and though *Gratian* records it for Law (Can. inter hæc. 6. Caus. 33. Quæst. 2.) yet the Case is alter'd since, and the Gloss upon that Canon (*verbo Gladium*) tells us, that the meaning is; that the Pope has not the Temporal Sword, *Quoad Executionem* only: the Power of the Temporal Sword belongs to the Emperor, but the Pope makes him Emperor, and gives him that Power: and this he proves out of a Decree of Pope *Innocent* 3. Cap. Venerabil. 34. Extra. De Elect. & Electi Potestate.

(q) *Hunc unum* (Petrum scilicet) *Principem Constituit, &c.* Ibid. in dicta Bulla.

(r) *Super Omnes Gentes, & Omnia Regna.* Ibid.

(*s*) Jer. 1. 10.

ſon. The Prophetical Office was not Hereditary or Succeſſive. 'Tis true, ſome Prophets preceded in time, and ſome afterwards followed: So (*t*) *Jeremy* was after *Iſaiah* about One hundred ſixty five years; *Ezekiel* after him Four and thirty years; *Daniel* after him Twenty years. But each Prophet had a new Call and Commiſſion, and that for particular and different purpoſes, as is evident by the Prophecies themſelves. 2. *Jeremy* and thoſe Prophets were Θεόπνευστοι, Divinely Inſpired, and that to an Infallibility, and their Prophecies (as Divine, and the Word of God) referr'd into the Sacred Canon of Scripture; Now although *Peter*, (not by Succeſſion from *Jeremy*, but by a new Call and Commiſſion from our bleſſed Saviour) was Θεόπνευστος, and had ſuch an Aſſiſtance of the Holy Spirit, as made him Infallible, and his Doctrine Divine Truth; yet ſuch aſſiſtance being perſonal in him, (as it was in all Prophets before him) his Succeſſors cannot, without Impudence and Impiety pretend to it; though *ſome of the* (u) *Canoniſts, the Jeſuits, and Papal Paraſites*, would have us believe (what the (*x*) World knows to be falſe) that they are Infallible.

(*t*) Vide Corn. A Lapide in Prin. Argument. Comment. ſui in Jeremiam.

(*u*) For proof of this, ſee the Quotations before Obſerv. 2.

(*x*) Pope *Honorius*, and Pope *Vigilius* anciently condemned for Hereticks in General Councils; and of later times, the General Councils of *Piſa*, *Conſtance*, and *Baſil* condemned others.

3. But that I may (in ſhort) come to the main ſcope and hinge of the Queſtion; the truth is Evident, That all theſe Popes in the Expoſition and Application of this Text in *Jeremy*, (notwithſtanding their pretended Supremacy and Infallibility) are miſerably miſtaken, and put a ſenſe

ſenſe upon it, which, before them, never any Father or Ancient Author did; no nor their own Learned Writers of later times, even when Popery moſt prevail'd; a ſenſe (if I may call it ſo) inconſiſtent with the true and certain meaning of *Jeremy*. For when 'tis in that Text, *I have ſet thee over the Nations and Kingdoms, to pull down, diſſipate, deſtroy, plant, and build*; That which (*y*) *Alexander*. III. (and other Popes after him) Cite this Text for, is, to infer a Power in *Jeremy*, (and from him, in them) ſo far, to pull down, diſſipate, and deſtroy, as to *Depoſe Kings and Emperors, and Abſolve their Subjects from all Oaths of Allegiance:* Though the Text mean nothing leſs; nor can any ſuch Impious Concluſion, by any (ſave poſſibly Popiſh) Logick, be deduced from it. For when the (*z*) Text ſays, *I have ſet thee over the Nations, to pull down, and deſtroy, &c.* 1. The meaning is not, that *Jeremy* (by this Commiſſion) had Power and Juriſdiction, (*per modum Imperantis*) as a Prince and Superior, *to pull down and deſtroy any man, much leſs Kings and Emperors*; nay ſo far was he from that, that he quietly and patiently ſubmitted to the Authority and Commands of Injuſt and Impious Superiors, (as is evident in his Prophecy) and was ſeveral times (*a*) Impriſon'd and caſt into Dungeons, with great danger of his Life, at *Jeruſalem*; and when carried Captive into *Egypt*, by ſome Rebellious Jews, who would not obey the Word of God by him, he was more miſerably uſed, and

(*y*) Vide Conſtitut. 9. Alexand. 3. In Bullario Rom. Tom. 1. p. 65. Col. 2.

(*z*) Jer. 1. 10.

(*a*) He is beaten by *Paſhur*. Jer. 20, 1. Apprehended and Arraigned. Jer. 26. 8. Impriſon'd by *Zedekiah*. Chap. 32. 3. and beaten and impriſon'd by the Princes. Jer. 37. 15. by them put into a Dungeon. Jer. 38. 6.

and at laſt, by them (*b*) murder'd and martyr'd. So far was *Jeremy* (after God had given him that (*c*) Commiſſion) from pulling down, or deſtroying any man, that (on the contrary) he patiently ſubmitted to his Superiors, and was by them (though moſt injuſtly) puniſhed, pull'd down, and at laſt deſtroy'd. 2. But the meaning of that Text evidently is, *I have ſet thee over Nations and Kingdoms, to pull down, deſtroy, and diſſipate*, &c. *Per modum Prophetantis, & Quid Judicio Juſto facturus eſſet Deus, prædicentis*; As a Prophet, to foretell what God would do; that (unleſs they repented) he would pull down, deſtroy, and diſſipate thoſe Nations and Kingdoms, againſt which (by God's expreſs Command) he Propheſied. *Jeremy* had no Commiſſion, no Power or Authority to pull down, or deſtroy any one ſingle Perſon, much leſs Kings and Emperors; nor did he ever do, or attempt any ſuch thing; he only Prophetied, and premoniſh'd them from God, that Deſtruction would come upon them for their ſins, but it was God only who could and did execute that Sentence, and when they repented not, deſtroyed them. So in Scripture, the Prophet is ſaid to do that, which he foretells will be done. *Joſeph* in Priſon, tells *Pharaoh*'s Butler and Baker, That *within three days the one ſhould be reſtored to his Place, and the other hanged.* This coming to paſs (not by any Power of *Joſeph*, for he was a Priſoner) yet the (*d*) Text ſays, That *He reſtored the one, and that He hang'd the other.* And

(*b*) *A ſuis Concivibus in Taphnis Ægypti, Lapidibus Obrutus, Martyr occubuit.* Ita Hieronymus, Tertull. Doroth. Epiphan. Iſiodor. &c. Corn. A Lapide Comment. in Jerem. in Argumento.

(*c*) The Commiſſion was given him, when he was a Child. Jer. 1. 6. 7. when he was 14. or 15. years old. So Corn. A Lapide in Prin. Argumenti Commentariis ſuis in Jeremiam præfixi.

(*d*) Gen. 41. 13.

this, thoſe Popes, who ſo often urge this Text of *Jeremy*, might have eaſily and certainly known, had they ſtudied Scripture and Divinity as much as Human Policy (as too (*e*) many of them do not) For what I have ſaid is expreſly ſaid in the very Text of *Jeremy*'s Prophetie; as he who compares and conſiders (*f*) two or three Chapters in it, may evidently ſee. Sure I am, (to ſay nothing of the Fathers and Ancient Writers of the Church) what I have ſaid of the true meaning of this place in *Jeremy*, is acknowledg'd even by the Jeſuits and Canoniſts (the greateſt Flatterers of the Pope, and Sticklers for his pretended Supremacy) who Expound the Text as I have done. I ſhall inſtance in One or Two.

1. *Corn: A. Lapide* (a Noted and Learned Jeſuit) Expounding this Place of *Jeremy*, ſays thus—(*g*) *I have ſet thee over the Nations, that thou ſhould pull up: That is* (ſaith he) *that thou ſhouldſt Threaten my Enemies, that unleſs they repent, I will pull them out of the Countries, where I have placed them.* And then he tells us truly, that this is the Opinion of *Hierome*, *Theodoret*, *Rabanus*, *Vatablus*, *Lyranus*, *Dion-Carthuſianus*, and others. And then he adds—(*h*) *That it is God* (not *Jeremy*) *who Pulls up, and Plants the Nations.* So that when 'tis ſaid—*I have ſet thee To pull up, and plant the Nations:* it is all one as if he had ſaid—*I have ſet thee to Threaten and Preach that God would Pull up and Plant thoſe Nations.* This is that we ſay and prove to be the meaning

(*e*) It is a memorable ſtory we are told to this purpoſe; not by any *Lutheran*, but a Learned *Sorbon* Doctor, an eare-witneſs of it, who ſays, That when Pope *Innocent.* X. was preſſed to Determine the Controverſie between the Jeſuits and *Janſeniſts*, He (who was bred a Lawyer) told them that he was *No Divine*, that Divinity was not *His Profeſſion, nor had he ſtudied Divinity.* Monſieur de St. Amour in his Journal Part. 3. Cap. 12. & p. 120.

(*f*) Vide Jer. 18. 7. 8. &c. Jer. 25. 15. 16. 17. &c. & Cap. 42. 10. & 45. 4.

(g) *Conſtitui Te ut Evellas*, i. e. *ut Interamineris Hoſtibus meis, (quos Regionibus ſuis Plantavi) Me inde per Bella, &c. evulſurum, niſi reſipuerint.* A Lapide. in Jer. 1. 70.

(h) *Ita Deus Plantat & Evellit Gentes: nam Jeremias reipſa nec plantavit nec Evulſit Gentes. Ergo, ut Evellas & Plantes; Idem eſt quod, ut has Gentes evellendas, illas plantandas A Deo mineris ac Prædices.* Idem Ibidem.

meaning of that Text in *Jeremy*, and the Jeſuit fully Conſents, and Acknowledges it to be true.

2. Pope *Innocent.* III. in his (*i*) Epiſtle to the Emperor of *Conſtantinople*, (amongſt ſeveral other places of Scripture) brings this Text of *Jeremy*, *to prove the Prieſt* (eſpecially *Peter's* Succeſſor the Pope) *to be* (k) *Superior to all Kings:* and yet *Bernardus de Botono* (the (*l*) Author of the Gloſs there) when he comes to Explain that Text—*I have ſet thee over the Nations, to pull up, and plant*; he has nothing *of Depoſing and ſetting up Kings*: but Conceives the meaning to be—That *Jeremy* was ſet over (*m*) Nations, *To pull up Vices, and plant Virtues.* He truly Conceives, that *Jeremy* was not Conſtituted *a Prince*, with Dominion and Juriſdiction over Kings and Emperors; to ſet them up, or pull them down, at his pleaſure; (to which purpoſe many of the Popes produce it) but *a Prophet*, to foretell them, what God would do. That is, *He would plant them*, if they were Penitent; if not, pull down and deſtroy them. So the Author of the Gloſs; and they tell us, that he (*n*) *writ moſt Learned Gloſſes* upon the Decretals of *Gregory.* IX. which (*o*) afterwards had the Approbation of Pope *Gregory* XIII. Be it concluded then, that *Pius.* V. and thoſe other Popes before mention'd (notwithſtanding their Infallibility) have miſerably miſtaken the true meaning of this place of *Jeremy.* And indeed he who reads and ſeriouſly Conſiders the ſeveral Places of Scripture,

(*i*) Cap. Solitæ. 6. Extra de Major. & Obedientia.

(k) *Oſtendit Sacerdotium præeminere Regibus, dicto Jeremiæ Gloſſa* ad dictum Cap. verbo. *Solitæ Benignitatis.*

(*l*) Vide Corpus Juris Can. Cum Gloſſis; Paris. 1612. In Nota, Titulum. Tom. 2. Immediatè (ſeu pagina proxima) ſequente.

(m) *Conſtitui Te, ut Evellas*] *Vitia ſcilicet. & plantes*] *Virtutes.* Gloſſa ad dictum Cap. Solitæ. verbo, Conſtitui Te, &c.

(n) *Gloſſas Eruditiſſimas Edidit.* Vid. dictam Notam in Prin. Tom 2. Juris Can. Paris 1612.

(*o*) Vid. Bullam Greg. 13. Corp. Juris Can. præfixam.

which the Popes of the laſt 600. years have explained in their Bulls and Decretals, and produc'd as proofs of their extravagant & uſurp'd Supremacy; I ſay, he will have juſt reaſon to believe, that Popes are not the beſt Expoſitors of Scripture. For Inſtance; (to omit others) I ſhall refer the Reader to thoſe (*p*) 8. or 9. Places, which Pope *Innoc.* III. and *Bonif.* VIII. have Cited, and Explain'd, in two of their Conſtitutions, both Extant in their (*q*) Canon Law, in the places before Cited, where the Expoſitions and Applications of thoſe places, by thoſe Popes, are not only evidently Erroneous, but (being repugnant to all good Senſe and Reaſon) exceedingly ridiculous: ſuch as may give their Adverſaries reaſon to believe that the Authors of ſuch wild Interpretations, are rather Fools than Infallible.

(*p*) 1. Peter 2. 13. 14. Jer. 1. 10. Gen. 1. 16. 17. &c. Joh. 21. 16. Matth. 16. 18. 19. Luc. 22. 38. Rom. 13. 1. 2. Gen. 1. 1. 1. Cor. 2. 15.

(*q*) That of *Innocent* 3. Cap. Solitæ. 6. Extra de Majorit. & Obed. And that of *Boniface.* 8. Cap. Unam Sanctam. 1. Eodem Tit. Extrav. Commun.

Obſerv. 5.

5. Pope *Pius.* V. here in the beginning of this his Bull, calls (*r*) *Peter* (as other Popes and their Paraſites uſually do) *Prince of the Apoſtles*; *and tells us, that our bleſſed Saviour did ſet and conſtitute him a Prince over all Nations and Kingdoms.* From whence, they (Illogically and without any ſhadow of Juſt Conſequence) would Conclude, *Peter's* Supremacy, his Dominion and Authority even over all the Apoſtles. For although *Peter* in the Goſpel (when the Names of the Twelve Apoſtles are numbred) is called (*s*) πρῶτος, *Primus*; and amongſt Latin Authors anciently (*Princeps Apoſtolorum*) The *Prince of the Apoſtles*; yet that (*t*) Papal Supremacy, which the Popes and their Party generally attribute to him, that they (as his Succeſſors)

(*r*) *Chriſtus Eccleſiam Apoſtolorum Principi tradidit gubernandam; & hunc unum Super Omnes Gentes & Omnia Regna Principem Conſtituit.* Dictæ Bullæ principio.

(*s*) Matth. 10. 2.

(*t*) *Petrus Apoſtolorum Primus & Primas, poterat Apoſtolis præcipere, & ſi in fide aut moribus errarent, Corrigere, &c.* Corn. A Lapide in Matth. 10. 2.

ceſſors) might have it themſelves, cannot thence be concluded. So (*u*) *Eraſmus* tells us, (out of St. *Hierome*) *That the Apoſtles in the other Evangeliſts, are not reckon'd in the Order they are in* Matthew; *leſt any man ſhould think, that* Peter *were firſt of all the Apoſtles, becauſe he is reckon'd in the firſt Place.* Matthew *reckons* Thomas *before himſelf; but* Mark *after him:* Matthew *reckons* Andrew *before* James *and* John, *but* Mark *after them. So St.* Paul *reckons* James *before* Peter *and* John, *though* Matthew *puts* Peter *firſt.* And *Eraſmus* there ſays further, that *Hierome* intimates, *That the Apoſtles were all (as to their Apoſtolick Office) Equal.* That which makes me believe, that what *Eraſmus* Obſerves out of *Hierome*, is true, is this; The Spaniſh Inquiſitors have damn'd it, and (in their *Index* (*x*) *Expurgatorius*) Commanded it to be blotted out. But *Eraſmus* adds further,—(*y*) *That it cannot Logically and firmly be concluded, from the Order wherein the Apoſtles are number'd, which of them is to be preferr'd before the reſt, becauſe where many are number'd, there is a neceſſity we begin with ſome one, and 'tis not material which we begin with.* And This the Inquiſitors let paſs, without a *Deleatur*; they do not condemn it to be blotted out, and ſo ſeem to approve it, otherwiſe it had not paſs'd; ſo that (even by our Adverſaries conſent) all that can be rationally Inferr'd, from that Text, where in numbering the Apoſtles, *Peter* is called πρῶτος, *firſt*, is only (*z*) a *Primacy* of Order, (which we willingly grant) but no Primacy (much leſs a Supremacy) of Authority, Dominion, and Juriſdiction over the reſt

(u) *Cæteri Evangeliſtæ Matthæum præponunt Thomæ, Matthæus Thomam Præfert. Paulus ad Galat.* 2. 9. *Jacobum primo Loco recenſet, ante Petrum & Johannem. Exiſtimat Hieronymus* (ſo *Eraſmus* ſays) *Ejus eſſe, Ordinem Apoſtolorum diſtribuere, Qui illos Elegit: innuens, Authoritatem Apoſtolis Omnibus Parem fuiſſe, quod ad Apoſtolici muneris functionem attinet.* Eraſmus in Locum.

(*x*) Index Librorum Prohib. & Expurg. Madriti. 1667. p. 289. Col. 1.

(y) *Certe ex Ordine recenſionis, non Efficaciter Colligitur Quis Cui ſit præferendus; ſiquidem ubi multi numerantur, aliquis primus ſit opportet.* Eraſmus ibidem, in Matth. 10. 2.

(z) So the word πρῶτος uſually ſignifies; *Euſebius* calls *Simon Magus*, πρῶτος πάντων αἱρέσεως Ἀρχηγὸς. *primus Dux Hæreſeos*, ſcilicet *Primus Ordine Temporis, non Juriſdictionis.* Euſeb. Hiſt. Lib. 2. Cap. 13. p. 51. Edit. Valeſii.

reſt of the Apoſtles; which the Pope and his Party deſire, and we juſtly deny. 2. And as πρῶτος or *Primus*; ſo *Princeps*, or *Prince* (amongſt the beſt Latin Authors) uſually ſignifies *Order Only*, or ſome *Excellent Quality* in thoſe who are call'd *Principes*, without any (*a*) *Authority or Juriſdiction* over thoſe in relation to whom they are ſo call'd. And that the Reſt of the Apoſtles were call'd *Principes* as well as *Peter*, I have Authentick warrant, even the *Roman Breviary*, reſtored according to the Decree of the Council of *Trent*, publiſh'd by *Pius* V. (The very Pope who publiſh'd this Impious Bull againſt Queen *Elizabeth*) and then Reviſed by the Authority of *Clement*. VIII. and *Urban* VIII. and Printed at *Antverp.* 1660. In this *Breviary*, we have this (*b*) Hymn, in the Office for the Feaſt of St. *Peter* and *Paul*;

Eccleſiarum Principes,
Belli Triumphales Duces,
Cæleſtis Aulæ Milites,
Et vera Mundi Lumina, &c.

Now in this Hymn *Peter* and *Paul* too, are call'd *Eccleſiarum Principes*, Princes of the Churches; For being a Hymn for the Feaſt of thoſe two Apoſtles; *Eccleſiarum Principes* cannot relate to leſs than two; nor Properly to any but them two in that Place. Though elſewhere it (*c*) relates to all the Apoſtles; as in the Place cited in the Margent; when after the Invitatory, (as they call it) (*d*) *Come let us adore the Lord, King of the Apoſtles*; it follows thus,

Æterna

(*a*) So *Homer* and *Virgil* are call'd *Poetarum Principes*. So in *Tully*, *Patroni Principes*, Eminent Advocates. So *Plato* and *Ariſtotle*, *Philoſophorum Principes*, and yet no Dominion or Juriſdiction meant in theſe Expreſſions.

(*b*) Dicti Breviarij Part. æſtivâ, ad Diem. 29. Junij, in Feſto SS. Apoſtolorum Petri & Pauli. p. 476. & in Feſto S. Andreæ. Nov. 30. Ibidem pag. 780.

(*c*) Vide Commune Sanctorum in Calce Partis Æſtivæ, dicti Breviarij, & in Communi Apoſtolorum & Evangeliſtarum. pag. 4.

(*d*) Ad matutinum, Invitatorium. *Regem Apoſtolorum Dominum, Venite adoremus.*

Æterna Christi munera,
Apostolorum Gloria,
Palmas & Hymnos debitos,
Lætis canamus mentibus.
Ecclesiarum (e) *Principes,*
Belli Triumphales Duces,
Cœlestis Aulæ Milites,
Et vera Mundi Lumina, &c.

So that if we may believe their own Authentick Breviary, Publish'd and Carefully Revised by these Popes, according to the Decree of the *Trent* Council; All the other Apostles (under our blessed Saviour, and by his Authority) were *Princes* of the Christian Church as well as (*f*) *Peter.* Now I desire to know, how these things will Consist? (*g*) *Pius.* V. in this Bull against Queen *Elizabeth*, says, That *our blessed Saviour Committed the Government of his Church to One Only, to* Peter, *and Constituted him Only a Prince over all Nations and Kingdoms* (so he in his Bull) and yet the same Pope, in this *Roman Breviary*, (for it was Approved and Published by him) and the Hymn here cited, says, That all the Apostles were *Ecclesiarum Principes*; and if so, then *Peter* was not the *Only Prince* to whom the Government of the Church was Committed; no, the Commission of every Apostle (given by our blessed Saviour) was as unlimited and as large as *Peters.* This will appear in all the Particulars of it, equally given to all, as they are expresly set down in Scripture, from whence alone, we can surely

(*e*) Vide Card. Cusan Opera p. 836. & Gratian. Caus. 2. Quæst. 7. Can. Beati. 37. & Theodoret in Gal. 2. p. 270. where *Peter* and *Paul* are called μεγάλοι καὶ πρῶτοι ἀπόστολοι. & in 2 Cor. 1. 6. p. 251. *Principes Apostolorum alij præter Petrum.* Vid. Bellarmin. de Rom. Pontif. l. 1. c. 12. p. 861. *Potestas clavium transivit ad alios Apostolos, & ad Omnes Ecclesiæ Principes, &c.* These are the words of Pope *Leo* (and he Infallible) cited there by *Bellarmine.*

(*f*) *Hoc erant utique & Cæteri Apostoli Quod fuit Petrus, Pari Consortio præditi & Honoris & Potestatis.* Cyprian de Unitate Ecclesiæ. p. 208. Edit. Rigaltij.

(*g*) *Ecclesiam suam Uni Soli, Petro Commisit gubernandam; & hunc Unum Super Omnes Gentes & Regna Principem Constituit.* Bulla dicta in Principio.

ſurely know, what their Authority and Commiſſion was. Our bleſſed Saviour tells them, and us, —(*h*) 1. *As my Father ſent me, ſo ſend I you.* There we have the Author and Authority of their Commiſſion. The ſame bleſſed Saviour of the World ſends them all. 2. Then he breath'd upon them, and ſaid, (*i*) *Receive ye the Holy Ghoſt.* There we have the Principle inabling them to diſcharge that great Office and Truſt repoſed in them; It was that Holy Spirit, which gave them, 1. *Infallibility in their Doctrine.* 2. *Power to work Miracles for* (k) *Confirmation of it.* 3. Then he adds, (*l*) *whoſe ſins ye retain, they are retained, &c.* Here we have the great Spiritual Power given them for the calling and governing the Church, which is elſewhere called, (*m*) *The Power of the Keys*; which Conſiſts in *binding and looſing, retaining and remitting ſins.* For ſo 'tis Explain'd by our bleſſed Saviour in the Place laſt cited, and is (by our Adverſaries) (*n*) confeſs'd. So that 'tis Evident that the Power of the Keys, the Power of binding and looſing, of retaining and remitting ſins, is Equally given to all the Apoſtles, to every One as well as *Peter.* 4. He Aſſigns them their Place and Province, where, and the way how they were to Exerciſe their Apoſtolical Power—(*o*) *Go and Teach All Nations, baptizing them, and teaching them to obſerve all things, whatſoever I have Commanded you.* Their Dioceſe was the World—(*p*) *Go ye into All The World, and preach the Goſpel to every Creature* (every man.) And the adminiſtring the Sacraments, and teaching men to believe and obſerve the whole Goſpel, was the buſineſs

(*h*) Joh. 20. 21.

(*i*) Ibidem. verſ. 22.

(*k*) Mark. 16. 20.

(*l*) Ibid. verſ. 23.

(*m*) Matth. 16. 19.

(n) *Miniſtri Eccleſiæ ad Remmiſſionem peccati, Per Virtutem Clavium Miniſterialiter operantur.* Lyran. in Joh. 20. 23. Vid. Tirinum, Menochium, &c. in Matth. 16. 19.

(*o*) Matth. 28. 19. 20.

(*p*) Mark. 16. 15.

buſineſs they were to do in that their Dioceſe. 5. And *to incourage* them to this great and difficult Work, he graciouſly promiſes his Preſence and Divine Aſſiſtance; *Lo, I am* (q) *with you Always, even to the End of the World.*

(q) Matth. 28.20.

Theſe are the Powers and Promiſes given to the Apoſtles, and (which to me ſeems Evident) without difference or diſtinction, Equally to all; to *Simon* the *Cannite*, (for (r) ſo it ſhould be writ) as well, and as much as to *Simon Peter*. If any think otherwiſe, if he can, and will (by any Cogent Reaſon) make it appear either, 1. That the foregoing Powers and Promiſes were not Equally given to all the Apoſtles. 2. Or that ſome other Power or Promiſe was (in Scripture) given peculiarly to *Peter*, whereby he had an Authority and Dominion over the other Apoſtles and the whole Church, to make *him Only a Prince over all Nations and Kingdoms*, (as Pope *Pius*. V. in this his wild Bull confidently affirms) I ſay, he who can and will make both or either of theſe appear, ſhall have my hearty thanks for the Diſcovery, and I ſhall (for the future) have a better Opinion of *Peter*'s Supremacy; which (at preſent) I take to be a groundleſs Error, without any proof or probability.

(r) *Simon*, who *Matth.* 10.4. is call'd *Simon* the *Cananite*, in the Syriack Verſion there, and *Luk.* 6.15. is call'd *Simon* ζηλώτης, which is the Greek word for *Cannita*, or *Cinnæus*. For the Syriack ܩܢܝܐ *Canna* ſignifies ζηλώτης. vid. Ang. Caminium, in Explicat. locorum. N. Teſt. p. 51.

Objectio.

I know that the Popes in their (s) Conſtitutions, and their Party uſually urge that place in (t) *Matthew* to prove *Peter*'s, (and thence their own) vaſt and Monarchical Supremacy over the whole Church, (even the Apoſtles themſelves not excepted) the words Theſe—*Thou art* Peter, *and upon*

(s) Vide Conſtitut. Bonif. 8. Cap. unam Sanctam. 1. De Majorit. & Obed. Extravag. Communes. & Innocent. 3. Cap. Solicitæ. 6. Extra. de Major. & Obedientiâ.

(t) Matth. 16.18.19.

This Rock, I will build my Church.—And I give unto thee, The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. From this Place, (moſt irrationally, and without any Senſe or Conſequence) they infer, *That* (u) Peter, *and every Succeſſor of his, was Conſtituted Supream Head, Prince and Monarch of the Univerſal Church. So that what* Peter *or his* (x) *Succeſſor ſhall* (è Cathedrâ) *Determine and Decree, is to be received, as if God himſelf had decreed it.* So *Tirinus*, and their Canon Law, in their moſt Correct Editions. Though this be Erroneous, and evidently Impious, yet *Tirinus*, *Gratian*, and their Canoniſts are not ſingular in this point, another Learned Jeſuit (in his Commentary on this Place) tells us, That when our bleſſed Saviour ſays, *On this Rock will I build my Church*; *he ſpeaks of* (y) Peter, *as the Fundamental Rock, on which the Church is built.* And he adds—(z) *That though our bleſſed Saviour was chiefly that Fundamental Rock, yet* Peter *and the Popes of* Rome *ſucceeded him, as his Vicars, with Supream Power, &c.* This place, they conceive, concerns no Apoſtle but *Peter*, and proves his, and his Succeſſors Supremacy.

To this, I ſay, 1. That all they ſay, in this particular, is *gratis dictum*; for they only ſay it, without any pretence of proof. If we will take their bare word, we may; otherwiſe we may chuſe; for they bring no proof to prove their Expoſition of this Text, ſuch as might command and neceſſitate our Aſſent. And then a bare denial, is Anſwer enough to a bare Aſſertion. For (as St. *Hierome* ſays in the like caſe) an unproved Poſition, *eâdem*

(u) *Promittit hic Chriſtus Petro, quod ipſe & Succeſſor Ejus Omnis, ſit Eccleſiæ Supremum Caput, Princeps & Monarcha.* Jac. Tirinus in Math. 16. 18. 19.

(x) *Quamvis mortalis homo ſit Petrus Ejuſque Succeſſor, tamen Cæleſti præditus Poteſtate, & quod ille è Cathedrâ decreverit, habendum eſt tanquam ab Ipſo Deo Decretum.* Idem Ibidem, ad verſ. 19. Gratian. Can. 2. *Sic Omnes.* diſt. 19.

(y) *De Petro ut Fundamentali Petra loquitur Chriſtus.* Joh. Stephan. Menochius in Matth. 16. 18.

(z) *Chriſtus eſt Fundamentalis Petra Præcipuè, ſed ei Succeſſerunt Petrus & reliqui ſummi Pontifices, ut Ejus Vicarij cum Summâ Poteſtate.* Menochius ibid. p. 41. Col. 2. vid. Gratian. Can. Innono. Diſt. 21.

Reſponſio. 1.

eâdem *facilitate rejicitur, quâ Affirmatur.* 2. When they ſay, *our bleſſed Saviour was the chief Fundamental Rock on which the Church was built, and that St.* Peter *and the Popes ſucceeded him, with Supream Power.* They conſequently muſt ſay Two things; 1. That our bleſſed Saviour left his Place and Office of being the Fundamental Rock, to *Peter*, when he left this World. For if he kept it, and ſtill do keep it, neither the Pope nor *Peter* could be his Succeſſors. No man can be Succeſſor and ſucceed into a Place till his Predeceſſor leave it. *Linus* neither did, nor could ſucceed *Peter* in the Biſhoprick of *Rome*, whilſt *Peter* liv'd, and poſſeſs'd it himſelf; ſo that by this Erroneous and Impious Doctrine, they have diſplac'd our bleſſed Saviour from being the Fundamental Rock, on which the Church is built, and inſtead of him, have plac'd *Peter* firſt, and then particular Popes ſucceſſively. And then let the World judge, in what a miſerable Condition the Church of Chriſt muſt be. 1. When the Fundamental Rock on which it was built, was an (a) *Idolater*, as *Marcellinus* was. 2. Or an *Heretick*, as (b) *Liberius*, (c) *Honorius*, (d) *Vigilius*, *&c.* were. 3. Or an *Impudent whorish Woman*, as *Johannes Anglicus*, or Pope (e) *Joan* certainly was. 4. Or when many Popes together, no leſs than Fifty (by the Confeſſion of their own Learned men) were (f) *Apoſtatici potiùs quam Apoſtolici.* 5. Or when the Popes were ſuch (g) Monſtrous Villains, *as were put into, and out of St.* Peter's *Chair*

(a) *Marcellinus Pontifex ad Scrificia Gentium ductus, Deos alienos Adoravit.* Plat. in vita Marcel.

(b) *Cum Arianis ſentiebat, &c* Plat. in vit. Liber.

(c) Honorius Synod. 6. damnatur. Act. 18. vid. Theoph. Chronograph. p. 299. 301. Anaſtaſ. Biblioth. in vitis Pontif. p. 54. Franciſ. Combefis in Auctario Biblioth. Græc. Patrum. Tom. 2. p. 66. Synodus Nicena. 2. apud Joverium. Part. 1. p. 106. Col. 2.

(d) Vid. Synod. 5. & Rich. Crakanthorp. in Vigilio Dormitante. Ed. Richerium in Hiſt. Concil. Generalium. p. 302.

(e) Vid. Plat. in vitâ Johan. 8. & Notas Car. Annibalis Fabretii, ad vitas Pont. Anaſt. p. 290.

(f) Vid. Genebrardi Chronol. circa Initium ſeculi. 10. l. 4. p. 807. ad Annum 901.

(g) *Tunc ſordiſſima Rom. Eccleſiæ facies, cum Romæ Dominarentur ſordidiſſimæ Meretrices, quarum arbitrio, Intruderentur in Sedem Petri earum Amaſij Pſeudopontifices; qui non niſi ad ſignanda tempora, in Catalogo Rom. Pontif. ſcripti: Quis enim à ſcortis intruſos ſine lege, legitimos dicere poſſit Romanos fuiſſe Pontifices?* Baronius Annal. Tom. 10. ad An. §. 10. p. 688. Edit. Annal.

912. §. 14. p. 663. vid. eundem an Ad. 897. §. 8. p. 624. & ad An. 925. *Antverp.* 1618. vid. loca & hic adde.

by Impudent Whores, made Popes by Violence and Simony, ſuch (as even in Baronius *his Judgment) none ſhould, or dared call true Popes, whoſe names were recorded only to fill up the Catalogues of the Roman Biſhops.* 6. Or in the Vacancies, when for (*b*) two or three years, and (if ſome (*i*) Writers ſay true) ſometime for Eight years, there was no Pope at all, and ſo (by this Doctrine) the Church had no *Fundamental Rock at all, for ſeveral years together.* 7. Laſtly, Or when they had for near (*k*) Fifty years together, *two or three Popes* at the ſame time; when it was Impoſſible they ſhould be all Legitimate, and true Succeſſors of St. *Peter*, and (what they pretend to) Vicars of Chriſt our bleſſed Saviour; and which, or whether any of them, were ſuch indeed, none did, or could know: Nay, 'tis certain (and muſt by our Adverſaries be confeſs'd, (unleſs they will deny their own received Principles) that ſometimes, all of the Pretenders were Impious Uſurpers of the Papal Chair, without any Juſt Right or Title to it. Then the firſt Council of (*l*) *Piſa* met (and it was a General One, conſiſting of above. 600. (*m*) Fathers) there were Two Popes in being (ſuch as they were) *Gregory* XII. and *Benedict.* XIII. who were both (*n*) Damn'd and Depoſed, as *Perjur'd Perſons, Schiſmaticks, and Hereticks, &c.* and that *by an unanimous Conſent and Decree of that Great Council.* At the Council at *Conſtance* (four or five (*o*) years after) there were three Popes; the two beforenamed, *Gregory* and *Benedict*, (who would not ſit down, though damn'd at *Piſa*, and *John.* XXIII. For the two former, what

(*b*) Poſt Clem. 4. vacat Sedes. Ann. 3. m. 2. dies. 10. Poſt Nicolaum 3. vacat Sedes. Ann. 3. Poſt Clement. 5. vacat Sedes. Ann. 2. m. 3. d. 17. Platina in Ejus vita.

(*i*) Sunt qui ſcribunt, poſt mortem Nicolai. 1. Sedem vacaſſe Ann. 8. Menſ. 7. d. 9. Platina in Calce vitæ Nicolai. 1.

(*k*) In that great Schiſm, commonly reckon'd for the 27. Schiſm in their Church; which begun about the Year 1378. *Urbanus.* 6. being Pope at *Rome*, and *Clem.* 7. at *Avignion.*

(*l*) Anno Dom. 1409. or as others. 1410.

(*m*) Longus A Coriolano. Summa Con. p. 857. Col. 2.

(*n*) *In maximâ Prelatorum Frequentiâ, utérque Pontifex ab iis damnatus eſt, utróque tanquam Perjuro, Schiſmatico, Hæretico, è Pontificatu dejecto.* Idem Ibidem Col. 1.

(*o*) Concil. Conſtantienſe Anno 1414.

what Villains they were, the Council of *Piſa* has told us. For *John.* XXIII. the Council of *Conſtance* gives him this Character—(p) *That he was a Perſon (all the time he was Pope) notoriouſly Scandalous to the Church, that his Life was damnable, and he in his Converſation guilty of Impieties not to be nam'd: And the Council adds, (in their Definitive Sentence of his Depoſition) (q) That he had broke his Vow, his Oath, and Promiſe made to God, and his Church, that he was Notoriouſly Simoniacal, and by his diſhoneſt and deteſtable Life and Manners notoriouſly Scandalous, &c.* Now if theſe (and ſuch other) Popes be the *Fundamental Rock* upon which the Church is built, (and this they ſay, and would have us believe it) She muſt of neceſſity be in a miſerable Condition, and the Gates of Hell muſt prevail againſt Her; when they evidently prevail againſt the Rock, upon which (they ſay) ſhe is built; for if the Rock and Foundation fail, that which is built upon it, muſt evidently fall and come to Ruin. This is the firſt Conſequence of their Doctrine, manifeſtly Erroneous: but this is not all; For there is a ſecond Conſequence of it, both Erroneous, and indeed Blaſphemous. For, 2. when *they ſay*, that our *bleſſed Saviour was the Fundamental Rock on which the Church was built*, and that *Peter* and the Popes after, did ſucceed him in that Place and Office, *cum Poteſtatis plenitudine*, (ſays *Pius.* V. here) *Cum Summâ Poteſtate* (as others Generally) Hence it follows, That the preſent Pope has (and every one of his Predeceſſors had) the ſame Power required to the being of a Fundamental Rock, which our

(p) *Nobis Legitimè Conſtat. Johan. Papam. 23. à tempore quo fuit aſſumptus, uſque nunc, Papatum in Scandalum Eccleſiæ notorium rexiſſe; vitâque ſua Damnabili ejúſque Nephandis moribus, populis exemplum vitæ Male præbuiſſe.* Concil. Conſtant. Seſſ. 10.

(q) *Johan. 23. Schiſmatis nutritivum, à voto, promiſſo, & Juramento per ſe Deo, Eccleſiæ & huic Concilio præſtitis dirimativum, Simoniacum notorium, ſuis Inhoneſtis & Deteſtabilibus vita & moribus Eccleſiam Dei & Populum Chriſtianum notorie ſcandalizantem.* Idem Concil. Seſſ. 12. in ſententia contra Johan. 23. definitivâ.

our bleſſed Saviour had. For if they ſucceed him in the *ſame Place*, and with *a Supream Power*, then they have the *ſame Place* and Power our bleſſed Saviour had. His Power neither was, nor could be greater then *Poteſtas ſumma*; (*ſummo non datur Superius*, there can be nothing higher then the higheſt, nor ſuperior to the Supream) and if *Peter* had, and every pitiful Pope has *poteſtatem ſummam*, Then they have a Power as great, and equal to that our Bleſſed Saviour had before he Reſigned it to his Succeſſors: But I might have ſaved the Labour of proving this; for 'tis Acknowledg'd and expreſly Affirm'd in their *Roman Catechiſm* (*ex Decreto Concilij Tridentini, juſſu* Pii. V. *Edito*) in which they ſay, that *Peter* was (r) *Caput & Princeps Omnium Apoſtolorum.* And then it there follows, *Chriſtus* (s) Petrum *Univerſi Fidelium Generis Caput, ut Qui ei ſucceſſit Eandem Plane Totius Eccleſiæ Poteſtatem habere voluerit.* It was our bleſſed Saviour's will, That *Peter* ſhould have *The ſame Power our bleſſed Saviour had. Sed Apage nugas Impias & Blaſphemas.* The bare recitation of ſuch wild Poſitions, ſhould and will be Confutation enough to all ſober Chriſtians, who are ſolicitous to maintain our bleſſed Saviour's Honor, and will never give that Place or Power to the Pope or *Peter*, which is ſolely and eternally due to their Redeemer.

(r) Catechiſmus Romanus. Part. 1. Cap. 10. §§. 11. 12.

(s) Ibid. §. 13. p. 117. Edit. Pariſ. 1635.

3. But further, when our Adverſaries, upon that Place of *Matthew* [*Thou* (t) *art* Peter, *and upon this Rock I will build my Church*] would have us believe, *That* Peter *was that Rock, while he liv'd, and his Succeſſors after him*; And thence infer their Su-

(t) Matth. 16. 19.

Supremacy. They muſt pardon our Infidelity, if we believe it not. For, 1. They do or might know, that not only Proteſtants, but the Fathers, and (*u*) Ancient Eccleſiaſtical Writers generally, by *Rock* in that Text, underſtand *not Peter's Perſon*, but *either the Profeſſion* of *his Faith* he there made, or our bleſſed Saviour. But our Adverſaries like not this Doctrine; And therefore when *Hilary* had truly ſaid—*Unum hoc eſt immobile fundamentum, Una Hæc eſt fœlix fidei Petra, Petri Ore Confeſſa*; and *Eraſmus* had put this Note in the Margent, *Petram Interpretatur Ipſam Fidei Profeſſionem*; and when the ſame *Eraſmus* on *Matth.*XVI.18. had cited *Auguſtin* for the ſame ſenſe of the place, which *Hilary* gives; And had put in the Margent —*Eccleſia non eſt fundata ſuper Petrum.* The (*x*) *Spaniſh* Inquiſitors command it to be blotted out of *Eraſmus* his Text and Margent; Although *Hilary* and *Auguſtin*, and many others (as they well knew) ſaid the ſame thing. 2. And this truth is ſo Evident, that not only the Fathers, and Ancient Authors, but Sober and Learned men in the Church of *Rome*, even in darkeſt times when Popery unhappily prevailed, were of the ſame Judgment; And by the *Rock* in this Place of *Matthew*, [*upon this Rock I will build my Church*] underſtand not *Peter*, but that *Confeſſion of his Faith* there made, to be meant. So (*y*) *John Semeca*, Author of the Gloſs upon *Gratian*, and (*z*) *Nic. Lyranus*, and *Anſel. Laudunenſis*, Author of the (*a*) *Interlineary Gloſs*, upon his Text of *Matthew*; by *the Rock* on which the Church was built, underſtand

(*u*) Vid. Chryſoſt. in Matth. 26. Hom. 82. pag. 702. Edit. 1607. Iſiod. Peluſiota. l. 1. Epiſt. 235. Aug. Retract. l. 1. c. 20. & De verbis Dom. Serm. 13. Tom. 18. Col. 58. ita Cyrillus & Anonymus in Catena Nicetæ Serrarum Epiſcopi ad Matth. 16. 18. vide Catenam Græcam in Matth. per Poſſinum Jeſuitam Cap. 16. 18. Hilarius Pictanienſ. De Trinitate. l. 2. p. 25. Edit. Eraſmi. Theophylact. in Matth. 16. 18.

(*x*) Index Librorum Prohibit: & Expurg. Madriti. 1667. In Deſid. Eraſmo. p. 289. Col. 1.

(*y*) *Super hanc Petram*; i. e. *ſuper fidei Tuæ ſolliditatem.* Can. loquitur. 18. Cauſ. 24. Quæſt. 1. verbo. Petram, in Gloſſa.

(*z*) *Super hanc Petram, quam Confeſſus es*; i. e. *Chriſtum.* Lyranus in Matth. 16. 18.

(a) *Super hanc Petram*, i. e. *Chriſtum in quem credis.* Gloſſa Interlinearia in dictum Locum.

derſtand *Chriſt* (our bleſſed Saviour) *and not Peter* (*b*). And a late Learned *Sorbon* Doctor (though he would ſeem to ſay, that *Peter* was that Rock) yet acknowledgeth, that by that Rock, the (*c*) *Faith of Peter might be meant*, and not his Perſon. Nay, which is more conſiderable (and may ſeem ſtrange to the Reader) the Fathers of the *Trent* Council expreſly ſay, *That the* (d) *Creed or Profeſſion of Faith, which the Church of* Rome *uſeth*, (the *Conſtantinopolitan Creed* they mean, and there ſet it down) *is The Firm and Only Foundation, againſt which the Gates of Hell can never prevail*; and our preſent (*e*) Text is in the Margent Cited for it, whence it evidently appears, that thoſe Fathers at *Trent* have Declared, That the Creed, or true Faith of Chriſt, is that firm Rock, and *The Only Foundation* on which the Church is built, and againſt which the Gates of Hell cannot prevail; and if *that Faith* be the *only Foundation* of ſuch firmneſs, then the Pope is not. For if there be another, then that is not (what the *Trent* Fathers ſay it is)

(*b*) So Gregorius Magnus in. 7. Pſalmos Pœnitential. Tom. 2. Operum Pariſ. 1619. pag. 908. *D. Chriſtus eſt Petra, à qua Petrus Nomen Accepit, & Super Quam ſe ædificaturum Eccleſiam dixit —— Quod Eccleſia nullis Perſecutionibus ſit ſuperanda, Ipſe Super Quem ædificata eſt, Oſtendit, cum ait, Portæ Inferorum non prævalebunt contra eam.* So Strabo Fuldenſis in his Ordin. Gloſſ. on Matth. 16.18. circa Ann. 840. And after them *Lyranus* (in the Place cited) who though he was a Franciſcan Frier, and flouriſhed almoſt Four hundred years ago, and in many things (as thoſe times were) Popiſh enough; yet he was not come ſo far, as to make *Peter*, or any but Chriſt, the Rock on which the Church was built: And again, on the 1. *Cor.* 3. 11. *Solus Chriſtus eſt Fundamentum Eccleſiæ, quod ex ſe firmitatem & ſtabilitatem habet.* And the Gloſs on their own Canon Law, ſays, That Chriſt was the Rock; for *Boniface.* 8. in that famous Extravagant. Cap. Unam Sanctam. 1. Indeavouring to prove the Papal Supremacy from ſeveral Places in Scripture; he adds, That the Authority given to *Peter* and his Succeſſors by our bleſſed Saviour, was not Human but Divine. *Hæc Authoritas, licet homini data, non humana, ſed potius Divina, ore divino Petro data & Succeſſoribus, &c.* The Gloſs on theſe words, *Eſt autem hæc Authoritas.* p. 191. ſays thus —— *Hæc Authoritas eſt Divina, quia firmata eſt in Petra firma, in Chriſto, qui erat verus Deus: & quod ſit Divina, quia fundata in eo; patet ex Evangelio; quia Chriſtus loquebatur cum dixit, Super hanc Petram; id eſt, Super meipſum (qui ſum Petra, & qui ſignificor per Petram) ædificabo Eccleſiam meam.* Ita Gloſſ. verbo, *Eſt autem hæc Authoritas.* Ad Cap. Unam Sanctam. 1. Extrav. Commun. (*c*) *Super hanc Petram*, i. e. *Super Ipſum Petrum, ſeu Petram ſeu Cepham, vel Super Fidem Petri quæ eſt Catholica.* Dr. Hen. Holden in Annotat. in Nov. Teſtam. Pariſ. 1660. ad Matth. 16.18. & ad. 7. Matth. verſ. 25. (*d*) *Synodus Statuit, præmittendam eſſe Confeſſionem Fidei —— Symbolum fidei; quo Romana Eccleſia utitur, tanquam Principium —— ac Fundamentum firmum ac Unicum, contra quod portæ Inferi nunquam prævalebunt.* Conc. Trident. Seſſ. 3. Feb. 4. Ann. 1546. (*e*) Matth. 16.18.

the

the *Only Foundation.* And laſtly, it is very conſiderable, what (*f*) *Stapleton* (their Learned Profeſſor at *Doway*, and great Champion of their Church) confeſſeth (and without great Impudence, he could not deny it) that not only *Chryſoſtome*, *Cyril*, and *Hilary*; but four Popes, *Leo*, *Agatho*, *Nicolas*, and *Adrian* (each of them the firſt of that name) have, in their *Decretal Epiſtles*, declared, That the Rock on which the Church was built, was not *Peter's Perſon*, but *his Faith or Confeſſion of it.* This was the Opinion of thoſe ancient Popes, and they as infallible ſure as any of their Succeſſors. By the way, (that we may obſerve the Contradiction amongſt our Adverſaries, notwithſtanding the pretended Infallibility of their Church) The *Trent Catechiſm* ſays—(g) *That* Peter *Only was the Rock on which our bleſſed Saviour built his Church.* And this the Author (or Authors) of the Catechiſm pretends to prove out of *Cyprian*, & ſome others there named. So that if the *Trent Council* ſay True: the *Creed*, or the *Confeſſion of the Cathol. Faith*, is the *Only Foundation* on which the Church is built, but if the *Trent Catechiſm* be in the Right, *Peter Only is that Rock and Foundation.* Now ſeeing it is impoſſible, that both theſe Poſitions ſhould be true, it Evidently follows, that there is an Error in the *Council* or *Catechiſm*, or (which I rather believe) in both. That this may further appear, I ſay,

4. That 'tis certain, and generally Confeſs'd, That *a Lively Faith, and a firm belief of the Goſpel, is a Rock and Foundation againſt which the Gates of Hell cannot prevail.* Our bleſſed Saviour tells us, That

(*f*) Per Petram, Confeſſionem Fidei intelligunt Chryſoſtomus, Cyrillus, Hilarius, & Rom. Pontifices, Leo magnus, Agatho, Nicolaus, & Adrianus primus in ſuis Decretalibus. Stapleton, Princep. Fidei Doct. Demonſtr. Controverſ. 2. l. 6. c. 2. p. 207. 208.

(g) *Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum; Ego dico Tibi, quia Tu es Petrus, & Super hanc Petram ædificabo Eccleſiam meam. Super Illum Unum ædificat Eccleſiam.* Catechiſ. Trid. ex Decreto Conc. Trid. à Pio. 5. Editus. Part. 1. Cap. 10. de. 9. Symboli Art. §. 12. p. 115. Edit. Pariſ. 1635.

he who (h) *hears his sayings, and doth them*; (he who really and practically believes the Gospel) *builds upon a Rock.* And St. *John* tell us, That *such Faith is* (i) *victorious, nay victory, and cannot be overcome.* Hence it is, that in the Liturgie of St. *James*, in the Administration of the Eucharist, they pray— *That God would bless the Sacred Elements, that they might be Effectual, to the* (k) *Establishment of the Holy Catholick Church, which he had Founded and Built upon the Rock of Faith.* But though Faith and a firm belief of the Gospel, be a Rock, yet 'tis not (as the *Trent* Fathers say) *the Only Rock*, on which the *Church is built.* *Peter* was a *Rock* too; this our Adversaries Confess, and earnestly Contend for. But neither was he the *Only Rock* (though the *Trent Catechism* and Popish Writers commonly say so) nor such *a Rock*, as they (without any Reason or Just Ground) would have him. That this may Appear, it is to be Considered, (1) That (by Evident Scripture) our *blessed Saviour is the Prime and Chief Fundamental Rock on which the whole Church is built.* (l) *Behold* (says God by *Isay*) *I lay in* Sion, *for a Foundation a Stone, a precious Corner Stone, a Sure Foundation, &c.* I know that in the Vulgar Latin of (m) *Sixtus.* V. and (n) *Clemens.* 8. it is untruly render'd— *Lapidem pretiosum in Fundamento Fundatum.* Whence (o) *Bellarmine* will have it meant of *Peter*, and so of the Pope; who (in his Opinion) is *Lapis pretiosus in Fundamento fundatus.* But had the Cardinal consulted the *Hebrew Text*, or the Version of the *Septuagint*, or (p) *Hieromes* Version

(h) Matth. 7.24.25.

(i) 1 Joh. 5. 4. 5.

(k) *Orat Sacerdos, ut Sacra Symbola Omnibus cedant,* εἰς στηριγμὸν τῆς ἁγίας καὶ Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας, ἣν ἐθεμελίωσας ἐπὶ τῷ Πέτραν τῆς πίστεως. In Lit. Jac. Græc. Paris. 1560. p. 20. vid. Fabr. Stapulensem in Matth. 16.18. So Pope Nicol. 2. *Ecclesia super Petram fidei fundata.* Gratian. Can. Omnes. 1. Dist. 22. And the Apostle in his Canonical Epistle (Jude 20.) adviseth all, *to build up themselves on their most holy Faith.*

(l) Isa. 28. 16.

(m) Edit. Rom. 1590.
(n) Edit. Rom. 1592.
(o) Bellarmine, in Præfat. ad Libr. de Pontif. Rom. vid. R. Crakanth. Contra Spalatens. Cap. 81. §. 3. p. 612.
(p) Vid. Hieronym. in Isaiæ 28. vers. 16. Isiodor. Clarius in 1. Cor. 3. 10. *Fundatissimum Fundamentum Christus.*

Verſion of both, and his Notes upon them; he might have ſeen his Error: But though *Bellarmine* Expound this Place of *Iſay*, to be meant of *Peter*; yet (*q*) *Peter himſelf* (who underſtood that Text as well as the Cardinal) refers it to our bleſſed Saviour, ſo does (*r*) *Paul* too; and if this be not ſufficient to Convince the Cardinal, and ſuch other Papal Paraſites; our bleſſed Saviour expounds it not of *Peter*, but himſelf, and that after he had (*ſ*) ſaid to *Peter*. —*Thou art* Peter, *and upon this Rock I will build my Church.* (2). This being granted (as of neceſſity it muſt) that our bleſſed Saviour is *the firſt Immoveable Rock, and moſt ſure Foundation on which the Church is built*; It is alſo granted, and muſt be ſo, (Scripture expreſly ſaying it) That *Peter is a Foundation too, on which the Church is built.* But in a way far different from that our Adverſaries dream of; (for they do but dream, nor will any Conſidering and Intelligent Perſon think them well awake when they writ ſuch things) For, 1. When we ſay, *That* Peter *is a Foundation on which the Church is built*; our meaning is not, that he has by this, any Prerogative or Superiority, much leſs (what our Adverſaries pretend) any Monarchical Supremacy over the reſt of the Apoſtles, and the whole Church; for every one of the Apoſtles is, as well and as much a Foundation of the Chriſtian Church, as *Peter*. The (*t*) Apoſtle tells us, That the *Church is a ſpiritual Houſe, which is built upon* (u) *The Foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets,*

(*q*) 1 Pet. 2. 6. 7. 8. and Act. 4. 11.

(*r*) Rom. 9. 33. & 10. 11. 1. Cor. 3. 11. & 1. Cor. 10. 4.

(*ſ*) Matth. 21. 42. But though *Paul* and *Peter*, and our bleſſed Saviour himſelf do expound the word *Rock* on which the Church is built, not to be meant of *Peter*, but *Chriſt the Meſſiah*, as appears by the foregoing Texts) yet *Maldonate* the Jeſuit (whoſe words I ſhall cite anon) ſays---- *That 'tis very far from ſenſe ſo to expound it.* Maldonate in Matth. 16. 17. p. 339. Col. 1. E. And yet Card. *Cuſanus* ſays, *That Chriſt was that Rock.* Operum p. 826. And ſo *Cyrill* in the Aurea Catenâ Græc. Patrum in Pſalmos David. 50. per Dan. Barbaram Patriarcham Aquileienſem; Venet. 1569. ad verſ. 2. Pſal. 39. (aliàs. 40. p. 400. 401. So Gregorius Magnus in 7. Pſal. Pœnitent. Tom. 2. p. 980. D. So Chryſoſtom, &c.

(*t*) 1. Pet. 2. 5.

(*u*) Eph. 2. 20.

Jesus Christ being the Chief Corner-stone. And St. *John* to the same purpose speaking of the Church, the New Jerusalem, says—(x) *The City had Twelve Foundations, and in them the names of the Twelve Apostles of the Lamb.* In these Texts, all the Apostles (*James* and *Paul*, as well as *Peter*) are Foundations of the Church equally, and without any distinction or difference; no Prerogative given to *Peter* above the rest; much less that vast Monarchical Supremacy which is pretended to. Both the Greek and Latin Fathers say, That the *Gospel*, the *Christian Faith*, or *the Creed* (which contains the Sum of it) or *Peter's Confession of our blessed Saviour to be Christ the Son of the Living God*, (which is the Chief Fundamental Article of our Faith, I say, *That* (in those Father's Judgment) *this Faith is the Foundation on which the Church is built*; St. *Augustin*, Explaining the Creed to the *Catechumens*, has these words—(y) *Know you* (saith he) *that this Creed is the Foundation on which the Edifice or Building of the Church is raised.* To the same purpose *Theophylact* tells us—(z) *That the Faith which* Peter *Confess'd, was to be the Foundation of the faithful, that is of the Church.* This is a Truth so evident, that a Learned Jesuit, having Cited and approved (a) *Alcazar*, (a Zealous Roman Catholick) for this very same Opinion, does not only receive and approve, but largely and undeniably prove it, out of *Clemens Romanus*, *Augustin*, *Hierome*, *Ruffin*, the (b) *Trent Council*, and (c) St. *Paul*: And then adds—(d) *That other Councils*

(x) Rev. 21. 14.

(y) *Noveritis Symbolum hoc esse Fundamentum super quod ædificium Ecclesiæ surrexit.* Aug. lib. 3. de Symbolo ad Catechumen. Tom. 9.

(z) Ἡ ὁμολογία ἣν ὡμολόγησας, Θεμέλιον μέλλει εἶναι τῶν πιστευόντων. Theophylact. in Matth. 16. 17. 18.

(a) *Alcazar*'s words are these —— *Censeo Apostolos ideo fundatores Ecclesiæ dici; quia fidei summam ediderunt, & effusi Cruoris Testimonio, necnon prædicatione & Miraculis in hominum animis inseverunt.* Corn. A Lapide in Apocal. 21. 14. p. 112. Col. 2. C.

(b) Concil. Trident. Sess. 3. *Apostolicum Symbolum vocat firmum atque Unicum Fundamentum, Contra quod portæ Inferi non prævalebunt.* Idem, ibid. Col. 2. E.

(c) *Tale Fundamentum à Paulo fuit Jactum.* 1 Cor. 3. 10. *ut Sapiens Architectus Fundamentum posui.* Idem, ibidem.

(d) *Idem dicunt alia Concilia & Patres.* Ibid.

Councils and Fathers ſay the ſame. Another (*e*) Learned Jeſuit confeſſes, that it was the opinion of many Ancient Fathers (yet he endeavours to Confute it) that thoſe words—*(upon this Rock I will build my Church)*;] are thus to be underſtood—Upon this *Faith*, or *Confeſſion of Faith which thou haſt made, (That I am Chriſt the Son of the Living God) will I build my Church*; And then he Cites many Fathers to prove it; and immediately quotes St. *Auguſtin*, and (with little reſpect or modeſty) ſays —*That* (*f*) Auguſtine's *Opinion was further from ſenſe, then thoſe he there Cited; becauſe he made Chriſt the Rock on which the Church was built.*

(3.) I take it then for Certain, and Confeſs'd, (and ſo does a very (*g*) Learned Jeſuit too, that the *Twelve Foundations*, in that Place in the *Revelation* before Cited (*Cap.* 21. 14.) ſignifies the Twelve Apoſtles on whom the Wall of the *New Jeruſalem*, or the Church of Chriſt was built; and therefore their Names (as St. *John* ſays) were written on thoſe Foundations, to ſignifie, that the Apoſtles (*Paul* as well as *Peter*) were Founders or Foundations of the Chriſtian Church. And that this may more diſtinctly appear, and from Scripture it ſelf, that every Apoſtle, (as well as *Peter*) is a Foundation of the Chriſtian Church; we are to Conſider, Firſt, That in Scripture the Church is commonly call'd (*h*) *a Houſe, the Houſe of God*; and every good Chriſtian is a (*i*) *Lively Stone* which goes to the *building of that ſpiritual Houſe*. 2. Our bleſſed

(e) *Sunt inter veteres Authores, qui Interpretantur ſuper hanc Petram*; i. e. *Super Hanc Fidem*; *aut Super hanc Fidei Confeſſionem quâ me Filium eſſe Dei vivi dixiſti: ut Hilarius, Greg: Nyſſenus, Chryſoſtomus, Cyrillus Alexandrinus, Ambroſius in Epiſtolas Pauli, &c.* Maldonat. in Matth. 16. 17. p. 339. Col. 1. E.

(f) *Longiùs etiam à Senſu Recedens Auguſtinus interpretatur, ſuper hanc Petram*, i. e. *Super meipſum, quia Petra erat Chriſtus.* Maldonat. ibid.

(g) *Certum eſt apud Omnes hæc. 12. Fundamenta (Rev. 21. 14.) ſignificare. 12. Apoſtolos; ipſorum enim humeris quaſi innixus Eccleſiæ murus recumbit. Ideo enim eorum nomina fundamentis Inſcripta ſunt, ut ſignificetur Ipſos eſſe fundamenta & fundatores (hæc enim duo eodem recidunt) Eccleſiæ.* Corn. A Lapide in Apoc. 21. 14. p. 312. Col. 1. D.

(h) 1. Tim. 3. 15. 1. Cor. 3. 9. 16.

(i) 1 Pet. 2. 5.

bleſſed Saviour *call'd* and *ſent all his Apoſtles* (as well as *Peter*) *to* (k) *build this Houſe. He gave ſome Apoſtles—for the Edifying* (εἰς οἰκοδομὴν) *or building the Body of Chriſt*; That is, the (*l*) Church. 3. The *Apoſtles all of them*, (*Paul* (*m*) as well as *Peter*) were *Maſter-Builders* of this Houſe. Evident it is (in the Text Cited) that St. *Paul* was a *Maſter-Builder*, and St. *Peter* was no more; nor is he any where in Scripture, expreſly ſaid to be ſo much; though I believe, and grant he was. 4. The Means by which theſe *Maſter-Builders* edify'd and built the Church, were theſe: Their diligent *Preaching of the Goſpel*, (firſt, and more Infallibly Communicated to them, then to any others) Their Pious and Exemplary Converſation, which made their Preaching more Effectual, and gave Reputation to it, and themſelves; Their Confirming with Miracles, and Sealing the Truth of it, with their Blood and Martyrdom. 5. Hence, the *Goſpel it ſelf* and our Chriſtan Faith, is call'd the *Foundation of the Church*; as may appear by what is ſaid before, and by St. *Paul*, who expreſly (*n*) calls it ſo. For that *Foundation*, which he there ſays he *had laid* at *Corinth* (as may appear from the Context) was the (*o*) *Goſpel* he had preach'd among them. So that (by the Authorities above Cited) I think it may appear, that Divines (Ancient and Modern, Proteſtant and Papiſt) ſeem to agree in this; That there is a double Foundation of the Church, *Doctrinal* and *Perſonal*: The firſt is the *Goſpel*, or thoſe Holy Precepts,

(*k*) Eph. 4. 11. 12.

(*l*) Eph. 1. 22. 23. *The Church which is his Body.*

(*m*) 1 Cor. 3. 9. 10. *And I* (ſays *Paul*) *as a Maſter-Builder*, &c.

(n) *Ye are Gods building, and as a ſkilful Maſter-Builder, I have laid The Foundation.* 1. Cor. 3. 11: 12. where σοφὸς, *peritum*, *ſignificat.* σοφὸς, ὁ τὴν Θείαν ἐμπειρίαν. Heſychius.

(o) *Fundamentum poſui*; i. e. *prima initia fidei Annunciavi.* Lyranus. *Annunciavi vitæ æternæ fundamentum*, id eſt, *Chriſtum.* Fab. Stapulenſis. Τὸ δὲ ἐυπρεπὲς Θεμέλιον. Theodor. vid. Cor. A Lapide in Apocal. 21. 14. p. 312. Col. 2. E. vid. Grotium in 1. Cor. 3. 10. Rom. 15. 20. Hebr. 6. 1. Ita etiam Lyranus & Gloſſa Interlinearia.

Precepts, and gracious Promiſes contain'd in it; On the belief and practiſe whereof, the Church ſolely relyes for Grace here, and Glory hereafter; And therefore, they are Commonly and Juſtly call'd the Foundation on which the Church is built. Whence it is very uſual in Scripture, to ſay, that by Preaching the Goſpel, the (*p*) *Church is Edify'd or Built.* And becauſe our bleſſed Saviour immediately call'd all his Apoſtles, gave them Authority, and the Infallible Aſſiſtance of his Spirit, and ſent them to Preach the Goſpel, and they (with great ſucceſs) did it, Converting Nations, building or founding Churches) therefore they were call'd *Maſter-Builders, Founders,* and *Foundations* of the Chriſtian Church; as our (*q*) Adverſaries Confeſs. Now (as to this Particular) as the Apoſtles were *Founders* or *Foundations* of the Chriſtian Church; *Peter* had no Preheminence or Prerogative above the other Apoſtles; He was no more *Petra*, a Founder or Foundation of the Church, then the other Apoſtles. Nay in this (if any) certainly St. *Paul* might challenge a Preference and Preheminence above *Peter* himſelf, or any of the Reſt. For he (with truth and modeſty enough, (*r*) tells us—That in Preaching the Goſpel *he laboured More then they All:* (And (*ſ*) *Irenæus* gives the Reaſon of it) His Sufferings were (*t*) more, He planted more Churches, He writ more Epiſtles, then they all; (his being Fourteen, and all the reſt but Seven, and they (in reſpect of his) ſhort ones too; which then

(*p*) Act. 9. 31. 1. Cor 14. 3. 5. 12. ſo St. *Paul's Authority was given* him for Edification, or building the Church. 2. Cor. 10. 8.

(*q*) *Ideo enim Apoſtolorum nomina Fundamentis Eccleſiæ Inſcripta ſunt.* Rev. 21. 14. *ut ſignificetur Ipſos eſſe Fundamenta & Fundatores (hæc enim duo eodem recidunt) Eccleſiæ.* Corn. A Lapide ubi ſupra, in Apoc. 21. 14. p. 312. Col. 1. D.

(*r*) 1. Cor. 15. 10. *I laboured More abundantly then They All.* And 2. Cor. 11. 23.

(*ſ*) *Plus reliquis: quia illi, ut plurimum, Judæis prædicabant, quorum facilis Catechizatio (cum legem & Prophetas admiſerunt) Paulus Gentibus, qui utráſque negabant.* Irenæus Adverſus Hæreſes lib. 4. cap. 41. p. 279. C. Edit. Feu-Ardentij.

(*t*) 2. Cor. 11. 23. Vid. Originem contra Celſum, Græco-Lat. p. 49.

then were, and ever ſince have been, and (while the World ſtands) will be Doctrinal Foundations of the Chriſtian Church. But that which makes more againſt *Peter*'s Supremacy, and for St. *Paul*'s Preference before him, (at leaſt his Independence upon *Peter* (as the Supream Monarch of the Church) is; That he tells the *Corinthians*, *That the care of* (u) *All The Churches lay upon him.* Nor that only, but that he *made Orders and* (x) *Conſtitutions for All thoſe Churches*, which they were bound to obſerve—*So I Ordain* (ſaith he) *in All the Churches.* So our Engliſh truly renders it. I know the Vulgar Latin (which the *Trent* (y) Fathers ridiculouſly declare Authentick) renders it otherwiſe—*So I teach in all Churches:* but the (z) *word* there, ſignifies not to teach, but *properly* to (a) *Ordain* and *Legally Conſtitute*, *Deſine*, and *Command.* So that thereupon Obedience becomes due from thoſe who are Concern'd in ſuch Conſtitution or Ordinance. And this *Theodoret* took to be the true meaning of that Text; and therefore he ſays, That *Paul*'s *Ordaining in all Churches*, was giving *them a* (b) *Law*, which they were to obey. So that here are two things expreſly ſaid of *Paul* in Scripture, and that by himſelf, who beſt knew, and was *Teſtis idoneus*, ὁ ϖιστότατος, a Witneſs beyond all Exception. 1. That the care of *All the Churches* lay upon him. 2. That he made Eccleſiaſtical *Laws and Conſtitutions for them All:* whereas (in Scripture) no ſuch thing is ſaid of *Peter*, or any other Apoſtle. Upon con-

(u) 2. Cor. 11. 28. πασῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν μεριμνα.

(x) 1. Cor. 7. 17. οὕτως ἐν ταῖς Ἐκκλησίαις πάσαις Διατάσσομαι.

(y) Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 4. In Decreto de Edit. Sacrorum Librorum.

(z) Διατάσσομαι; Inde διάταγμα, *Edictum*, διάταξις, *Conſtitutio.* Gloſſæ veteres in Calce Cyrilli, &c.

(a) Διατάττομαι, τὸ διορίζομαι, καὶ προστάττω: οἷον ὁ Βασιλεὺς διατάττεται τοῖς ὑφ' ἑαυτὸν ὑπηκόοις——ἐξ ὧν κύριος καὶ διάταγμα, ἡ τοῦ Βασιλέως προσταγή. Phavorinus. verbo διατάττομαι.

(b) Τοῖς ὑπὸ κληθῆσιν ἐκείνῃ νενομοθέτηκεν——πᾶσι νομοθετῶν τὰ καλάλληλα. Theodor. in. 1. Cor. 7. 17. *Oecumenius* and *Theophylact* ſay to the ſame purpoſe, on the ſame place. Confer 1. Cor. 16. 1.

conſideration of the Premiſes, ſome of the Ancients have call'd St. *Paul, A Preacher to the whole World*; So (c) *Photius* and *Nicolaus Methonenſis Epiſcopus*, ſpeaking of ſeveral Apoſtles Officiating at ſeveral places; as of *James* at *Jeruſalem*, *John* in *Aſia*, *Peter* and *Paul* at *Antioch*, &c. He adds; concerning (d) *Paul*—*That he did particularly Officiate to the whole World.* And to the ſame purpoſe *Theodoret*, Expounding the words of the Apoſtle—*That the care of All the Churches lay upon him*; He ſays, *That the* (e) *ſollicitude and care of the Whole World lay upon* Paul. More than this cannot be ſaid of *Peter*, nor is there half ſo much ſaid of him, as of St. *Paul* in Scripture. Had *Peter* told us —*That the care of All the Churches lay upon him*; and that He made *Orders and Conſtitutions*, *to be obſerved In All Churches*, (both which are expreſly ſaid of St. *Paul*) the Canoniſts and Popiſh Party, would have had ſome pretence (who now have none) for *Peter*'s Supremacy. I urge not this, to Aſcribe to *Paul*, that Supremacy we deny to *Peter*; (For neither had they, nor any other Apoſtle, any ſuch thing) but only to ſhew, That St. *Paul* (his Labors, Sufferings, the many Churches founded by him, and His Canonical Writings conſider'd) may be thought (not without reaſon) a more eminent Founder of the Chriſtian Church, then St. *Peter*. 2. But as it is, and muſt be confeſs'd by Divines, Ancient and Modern, Proteſtants and Papiſts, That the Goſpel is the Doctrinal

(c) Τῆς οἰκουμένης κήρυξ. Photius Epiſt. 117. pag. 158. & ibid. p. 109.

(d) Παῦλος δὲ ἰδίως, τῇ πάσῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ. *Paulus autem peculiariter Orbi Universo.* Nicol. Methon. De Corp. & Sang. Chriſti in magna Bibl. Patrum. Tom. 12. p. 519.

(e) Πάσης τῆς οἰκουμένης περιφέρω τὴν μέριμναν. *Universi Orbis Terrarum ſollicitudinem mecum gero.* Theodor. in 2. Cor. 11. 28.

Foundation, and that *Petra*, on which the Church is Built; So there is alſo a Perſonal Foundation, evidently mention'd in Scripture. I mean Perſons, on whom the Chriſtian Church is built: And they are

1. Our bleſſed Saviour.
2. His Apoſtles.

1. Our bleſſed Saviour.

1. That our bleſſed Saviour is a Rock, and that κατ' Ἐξοχὴν, the moſt firm and immoveable Rock on which the Church is Built, is evident from the (*f*) *Scriptures* before Cited. Such a Rock, as *Peter* neither was, nor could be, much leſs any of thoſe they call his Succeſſors. For, 1. Our bleſſed Saviour was, and ſtill is a Rock on (*g*) which (as *Irenæus* tells us) the *Univerſal Church*, both before and ſince his coming into the World, was built. He was (*h*) *promiſed by God* preſently after the fall of *Adam*, and then ſucceſsfully *by* (*i*) *all the Prophets*; His Death and Paſſion was a Propitiation, as well for the Sins of thoſe who (*k*) *lived before*, as ours who live after it; and thoſe Promiſes of the Meſſiah were ſuch, as all the Patriarchs, Prophets, and Pious men before Chriſt did (*l*) *know and believe*. Nay, (if we believe *Euſe-*

(*f*) Vid. Matth. 21. 42. Rom. 9. 33. & Rom. 10. 11. & 1. Cor. 3. 11. & 1. Cor. 10. 4. & Act. 4. 11. & 1. Pet. 2. 6. 7. 8. & Iſai. 28. 16. The Septuagint Tranſlate it thus —— διὰ τοῦτο ἐγὼ ἐμβάλλω εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιὼν λίθον πολυτελῆ, ἐκλεκτὸν, ἀκρογωνιαῖον, ἔντιμον, εἰς τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς. Vid. Hieronymum in locum; & 1 Pet. 2. 6. 7. ubi Iſaiam citat, & eadem pene verba habet, quæ apud. 70. Interpretes hodiè Extant. vide Procopium in Iſai. 44. p. 504. & Fabr. Stapulenſem in Matth. 16. 18.

(*g*) *Chriſtus lapis ſummus Angularis Omnia ſuſtinens, & in unam fidem Abrahæ Colligens eos, qui in Utroque Teſtamento apti ſunt in ædificationem Dei.* Irenæus lib. 4. c. 4. p. 380. Edit. Feuardentij. (*h*) Gen. 3. 15. (*i*) Act. 13. 18. 24. Luc. 1. 70. & Luc. 24. 27. (*k*) Hebr. 9. 15. (*l*) Hebr. 11. 13. vid. Euſebium Hiſt. lib. 1. cap. 2. pag. 6. B Edit. Valeſij. Τοῦτον γὰρ, οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἀνθρωπογονίας πάντες, &c. *Omnes ab origine Generis humani qui Juſtitiæ laude floruerunt, ut Abraham, Moſes, & Quicunque poſtea Juſti, Omnes Chriſtum agnoverunt, eique tanquam Dei Filio, debitum Cultum Exhibuerunt.* Et Demonſtrat. Evang. lib. 1. Capp. 5. 6.

bius

bius) the Promises of the Messias, were (*m*) *clearly and distinctly revealed to the Ancient Patriarchs and Prophets* (though in a less degree and measure of clearness) and their Belief and suitable Obedience such, that (though they had not the *name*, yet they might *truly be* (n) *call'd Christians before Christ.* The Apostle tells us, That *the* (o) *Gospel was preached to Abraham*, and so it was to all the *Ancient Church, by the* (p) *Prophets*; who foretold them of the Incarnation, Passion, and Resurrection of Christ. It was the Gospel St. *Paul* every where preach'd, and yet he says, that *He preached No* (q) *other Things, then those which The Prophets And Moses did say should come.* And this is a truth so manifest, that (to say no more of the Ancient Christian Writers) (*r*) *Peter Lombard*, and the Popish School-men, writing *De fide Antiquorum*, of the Faith by which the Saints, before our blessed Saviour, were saved; *they all say*, that they then (as we now) were saved by Faith *in Christ their Redeemer.* The difference was, 1. They believed *in Christo Exhibendo*, we *in Christo Actu Exhibito.* 2. *Their Faith* before our blessed Saviour's coming, was more Imperfect and Implicit; *Ours* (since he is come, and the Gospel clearly publish'd) much more Perfect and Explicite. This I say, to prove that our blessed Saviour was the Rock, on which the Church under the *Old Testament* was built, and (in this Particular) such a Rock and Foundation of the Church as *Peter* never was, nor could be; it being impossible he should be a Foundation of that Church which was founded almost Four

(m) Σαφῶς τὸν Χριστὸν ἥδεσαν. *Christum distincte cognitum habuerunt.* Euseb. Hist. lib. 1. c. 4. p. 16. B.

(n) Ἔργῳ Χριστιανοὺς, εἰ καὶ μὴ ὀνόματι. *Si non nomine, reipsa tamen Christianos.* Idem plane habet Augustinus, Retract. lib. 1. cap. 13.

(o) Galat. 3. 8.

(p) Luc. 24. 25. 26. 27. 44.

(q) Act. 26. 22. 23. and Act. 28. 23.

(r) Lombard. Sent. l. 3. Dist. 25. vid. Johan. Martinez de Ripalda ad dictam Distinctionem.

thousand years before he was born. 2. Our blessed Saviour is a Rock and Foundation, on which the whole *Christian Church* is built, even the Apostles themselves, as well as others: who (all of them, (*f*) *Peter* as well as *Paul*) in respect of Christ (who is the great Immoveable Rock, which sustains the (*t*) whole Building) are *Superstructions*; though otherwise, in respect of the Christian World converted by their Preaching, they *are call'd Foundations*; yet only Secundary Foundations, all of which are built upon the Principal and prime Foundation Jesus Christ (*u*). So in the like Instance, all the Apostles (*Peter* as well as the rest) were both *Sheep* and *Shepherds*. 1. Sheep, in respect of Christ, who is the (*x*) *great* and (*y*) *chief* Shepherd. *My* (*z*) *Sheep hear my voice*, (says our blessed Saviour:) The Apostles did so; when he call'd them, they heard and obey'd him. Again, *I lay* (*a*) *down my life for my Sheep*; so he did for his Apostles, else they could not have been saved;

(f) *Augustinus in Evang. secundum Matth.* Serm. 13. Tom. 10. p. 58. D. Basil. 1569. *Super hanc Petram quam confessus es, dicens, Tu es Christus Filius Dei vivi, ædificabo Ecclesiam meam. Id est, Super Meipsum ædificabo Ecclesiam meam. Super Me ædificabo Te; non Me super Te* —— *Non in Pauli, nec in Petri Nomine baptizati sumus, sed Christi; ut Petrus ædificetur super Petram, non Petra super Petrum.* Ibid. pag. 59. A.

(t) Ἁπάντων γὰρ θεμέλιος ὁ Χριστός, &c. *Omnium siquidem fundamentum est Christus, qui sibi ad mota, fixa firmáque sustineat.* Procopius in Cap. 44. Isaiæ, p. 504. And a little after —— Τὸ θεμέλιον, &c. *Ecclesiæ idem fundamentum jecit, qui Ipse Fundamentum est, super quod & nos, tanquam Lapides pretiosi, superstruimur.* Procopius ibid. pag. 519. *Omnis Ecclesiæ Compages innititur & Incumbit, ut nunquam cadat, summo Angulari Lapide Christo Jesu.* Augustin. Enarrat. in Psal. 86. Tom. 8. pag. 955. Operum Basil. 1569.

(u) *Fundamentum est solus Christus, vel fides Ipsius.* Object. Apoc. 21. 14. *Apostoli sunt Fundamenta.* Sol 1. *Fundamentum propriè, est illud quod habet firmitatem & stabilitatem in se; sic Solus Christus est Fundamentum.* 2. *Impropriè, illud quod adhæret primo Fundamento; sicut sunt Lapides primarij Fundamento inhærentes: sic Apostoli dicuntur fundamenta qui Primitùs Adhæserunt Christo.* Lyranus in. 1. Cor. 3. 11. vid. Pet. Lombard. in locum. pag. 73. C. D. *Christus primus Lapis & Angularis; super Christum Apostoli & Prophetæ, super illos, Nos ædificati sumus.* Maldonatus in Matth. 16 pag. 342. And again —— *Multi in eodem Fundamento Lapides sunt; summus & primus solus est Christus, & præter illud, Fundamentum Aliud nemo potest ponere; super illud autem, etiam alia sunt, quæ eo nituntur, Fundamenta: nam & Apostoli & Prophetæ Fundamentum Appellantur, sed ipso summo Angulari Lapide Christo Jesu.* Eph. 2. 20. Maldonat. in Matth. 7. 24. p. 178.

(x) Τὸν ποιμένα τὸν μέγαν. Hebr. 13. 20. (y) Ἀρχιποίμην. 1. Pet. 5. 4.

(z) John 10. 27. (a) John 10. 15.

And

And therefore they alſo are his Sheep. 2. Yet they were Shepherds too (ſent by, and ſubordinate to the great and chief Shepherd *Jeſus Chriſt*) in reſpect of the Church and Chriſtians, over which the (*b*) Holy Ghoſt had ſet them. 3. Our bleſſed Saviour is ſuch a *foundation and Founder of his Church*, as does not find, but make theſe *Lively Stones*, which are the Materials with which he builds it. He gives his Spirit, and by it Grace and a Lively Faith, which things alone make men Lively Stones, and fit for that Building. This no Apoſtle, (not *Peter*, much leſs any ſucceeding Pope) ever did, or could do; nor (without great folly and impiety) can pretend to. 4. Our bleſſed Saviour is ſuch a Rock, ſuch a Foundation and Founder of the Church, as was and is Proprietary and the ſole true Owner of it; 'tis *his Houſe, purchaſed with his precious Blood*; and he ever had, and ſtill hath a Magiſterial and Imperial power over it, to rule and govern it; He is (*c*) *King of Saints*. 'Tis true, the Prophets and Apoſtles are called Foundations and Founders of the Church; Thoſe of the *Judaical Church*, before our bleſſed Saviour's Incarnation; theſe of the *Chriſtian Church*, after it. But the Power, and the Authority, the Prophets or Apoſtles had, (even the greateſt of them (*Moſes*, or *Peter*) was only *Miniſterial*, the Authority of *Servants*, deriv'd from our bleſſed Saviour, and Exerciſed under him. So the Apoſtle tells us—(*d*) *That* Moſes *was faithful in all his Houſe*, (i. e. in the Judaical Church) *As A Servant*; but Chriſt *as a Son*, over his

(*b*) Act. 20. 28.

(*c*) Rev. 15. 3.

(*d*) Hebr. 3. 5. 6. Μωσῆς ἐν ὅλῳ, *ut famulus*: Χριστὸς ἐπὶ ὅλον, *ſuper domum, ut Filius & Dominus.*

his *Own Houſe*, whoſe Houſe *Are We*, &c. So in the Chriſtian Church, the Apoſtles (All of them) were Prime and *Principal Miniſters*, from and under Chriſt, to call and build the Church. They were Servants of Chriſt, and (for his (*e*) ſake) of the Church: they had *Miniſterium*, but not *Imperium*. Neither *Peter*, nor any other, had that vaſt Monarchical Supremacy over the whole Church, which is (not without great Error and Impiety) pretended to; when they blaſphemouſly ſay—*That* Peter (*f*) *was our bleſſed Saviours Succeſſor, and (by him) Conſtituted the Head of the Univerſal Church, with the very ſame Power our bleſſed Saviour had.* But this they ſay only, without any Proof or Probability; and ſo *tranſeat cum cæteris erroribus.*

(*e*) 2. Cor. 4. 5.

(*f*) *Chriſtus Petrum Univerſi fidelium Generis Caput Conſtituit——ut qui Ei Succeſſit, Eandem Plane Totius Eccleſiæ Poteſtatem habere voluerit.* Catechiſmus Tridentinus Part. 1. cap. 10. §§. 11. 12. & præcipuè. §. 13. p. 117. Edit. Pariſ. 1635.

2. The Apoſtles.

2. But although we ſay, (and have evident Reaſon and Authority for it) That our bleſſed Saviour was the one and *only prime and chief foundation and founder of the Church*, and all the Apoſtles (*Peter* as well as the Reſt) *Superſtructions* in reſpect of him; yet we know and acknowledge, that (both in Scripture and Antiquity) they are called *Foundations and Founders* of the Chriſtian Church in reſpect of the Churches, call'd, *Converted*, and Conſtituted by them; but all Equally ſo; *Peter* was no more a foundation then *Paul*, or *James*, or *John*. For, 1. They were all *immediately call'd* by our (*g*) bleſſed Saviour, without any dependence (*h*) upon *Peter*, or any body elſe, (as is Evident in the Text it ſelf) And this is generally Confeſs'd by the Popiſh Commentators, even the

(*g*) Matth. 10. 1. 2. 3. &c. Mark. 3. 14. Luk. 9. 1. &c.

(*h*) *Paulus Apoſtolus non ab hominibus nec per hominem*, Gal. 1. 1. ὁ Παῦλος ἀπόστολος, &c. *Dominus eum vocavit cœlitus, homine non uſus Adminiſtro.* Theodoret in loc. *Non Petro.* Eſtius in locum.

the Jeſuits, ſuch as *Tirinus*, *Menochius*, *&c.* I ſay, all the Apoſtles had this *immediate calling* to their Apoſtleſhip, from our bleſſed Saviour, except *Matthias*; and he was not choſen by *Peter* (who neither knew nor had any ſuch Supremacy, as without all reaſon, is now aſcribed to him) but the (*i*) *Colledge of the Apoſtles*, and conſent of the faithful there preſent. And though a Learned Jeſuit, (zealous for *Peter*, and the Popes Supremacy) *would have* Peter *to be the* (k) *Director in that buſineſs* (*the Election of* Matthias) yet he cannot deny, but it was done by the *Common* (l) *Conſent of the Apoſtles and Brethren.* 2. As the Apoſtles all of them, (*Matthias* excepted) had their *call* Immediately and Equally from our bleſſed Saviour, without any dependence upon St. *Peter*; ſo they had their *Commiſſion immediately* from him, and in it, the very ſame Power, equally given to all. The ſame power given to any one, (even St. *Peter*) was given to every one. This is Evident, 1. From thoſe plain Texts where their (*m*) Commiſſion and Apoſtolical Power is given them by our bleſſed Saviour, before the Reſurrection; when they were ſent to *the* (*n*) *Jews* only; and the very ſame Power equally given to all. 2. And from thoſe other (as clear and plain) Texts, wherein (after the Reſurrection) they had Commiſſion and Authority given them by our bleſſed Saviour, to *preach to* (o) *all Nations*; where it is —*As my Father ſent me, ſo I ſend you*, and *Go ye*, *&c.* All equally ſent, no difference or diſtinction of the Perſons, as to any Priviledge or Precedence, no Degrees

(i) *Matthias à Collegio Apoſtolorum factus eſt Apoſtolus; Ita* Eſtius *in* Gal. 1. 1.

(k) *Hæc omnia facta ſunt dirigente Petro, qui totius Operis fuit Chorագus.* A Lapide in cap. 1. Act. Apoſt. p. 57. Col. 1. C.

(l) *Apoſtoli cæteríque fideles Communi conſenſu Nominarunt duos*, &c. A Lapide, ibidem.

(*m*) Matth. 10. 1. 2. 3. &c. Mark. 3. 13. 14. 15. Luk. 9. 1.

(*n*) Matth. 10. 5. 6.

(*o*) Matth. 28. 18. 19. Mark. 16. 15. 16. John. 20. 22. 23.

Degrees of Power more or greater in one, then every one. Their Commiſſion and Authority given in it, was the very ſame, and equally given to all the Apoſtles. Theſe Truths are ſo evident in the Text, that ſome ſober Popiſh Writers do both profeſs and induſtriouſly prove them. *Franc: A Victoria*, (prime Profeſſor of Divinity at *Salamanca* in *Spain*, and (as they eſteemed and called him) *an* (p) *Excellent and Incomparable Divine*) Propoſes and proves theſe two Concluſions. 1. *All the* (q) *Power the Apoſtles had, was* (*by them*) *received Immediately from Chriſt.* 2. *All the* (r) *Apoſtles had Equal Power with* Peter: And then he Explains his meaning thus —(ſ) *That every Apoſtle had Eccleſiaſtical Power in the whole World, and to do Every Act, which* Peter *had Power to do.* But then (to pleaſe the Pope and his Party) he *Excepts thoſe Acts which were proper and belong'd* (t) *peculiarly to the Pope; as Calling of a General Council.* But this is *gratis dictum*, without any pretence of proof, or probability from Scripture, and evidently contradictory to the known Practiſe of the Chriſtian World, after the Emperors became Chriſtians, who alone (and not the Pope) call'd all the Ancient Councils; as is fully proved by a late and Learned (u) *Sorbon* Doctor.

5. But to proceed; That Place in (x) *Matthew* is urged in the foregoing Objection, to prove the Monarchical Supremacy of *Peter* —*I Give unto thee, the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatſoever thou ſhalt bind on Earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven, &c.* Now that I may give a ſhort and

(p) *Franciſ. A Victoria. SS. Theol. Salamanticenſis Academiæ, in primariâ Cathedra Profeſſore Eximio & Incomparabili.* Ita habet Libri ſui Epigraphe ſeu Titulus.

(q) *Omnem Poteſtatem, quam Apoſtoli habuerunt, reciperunt Immediatè à Chriſto.* Victoria Prelect. 2. De Poteſt. Eccleſ. Conc. 3. p. 84.

(r) *Apoſtoli Omnes habuerunt æqualem Poteſtatem cum Petro.* Ibid. Conc. 4. p. 85.

(ſ) *Quod ſic Intelligo; quod quilibet Apoſtolus habuit Poteſtatem Eccleſiaſticam in toto Orbe, & ad Omnes Actus ad quos Petrus habuit.* Ibid.

(t) *Non loquor de illis Actibus, qui ſpectant ad ſolum ſummum Pontificem, ut Congregatio Generalis Concilij.* Ibidem.

(u) Vid. Hiſt. Conc. Generalium, per Ed. Richerium Doct. & Socium Sorbonicum. Colon. 1680. where he clearly proves, the firſt Eight General Councils were call'd by the Emperors.

(x) Matth. 16. 19.

and distinct Answer to this place: I consider,

1. That this Text is generally urg'd (though most Impertinently) to prove *Peter*'s and the Popes Power over Kings and Emperors. So (*y*) *Innocent*. III. Cites it to prove, that the *Emperor is subject to the Pope*. To the same purpose Pope *Boniface* VIII. produceth it, in his Impious and (as to the Nonsense and Inconsequence of it) ridiculous (*z*) Extravagant; which (*a*) *Bellarmine* approves, and *Leo*. X. and his (*b*) *Lateran Council* (which they call a General one) Innovates and Confirms; and yet a late (*c*) Jesuit, expresly tells us, (and you may be sure, with the (*d*) Approbation of his Superiors) *That the Keys were given Only to* Peter. These, and many more, quote this Place to the same purpose.

2. It is certain (and (*e*) Confess'd) that our blessed Saviour in this place of *Matthew*, does not *Actually give* St. *Peter* the Power of the Keys (be what it will) but (*pro futuro*) promise that he will give it. For it is in that Text, δώσω, *dabo, I will give*, not *I have given*, or *do give*; and therefore they must shew some other place in Scripture, where that Power is Actually given to *Peter*, and that to him alone; else, (if it be given to the other Apostles as well as to him) it will be Impossible to prove his Prerogative and Supremacy over the other Apostles, from that Power, which they have as well as he.

(*y*) Cap. Solicit. 6. Extra De Major. & Obedientiâ. vid. Baron. Tom. 11. ad Ann. 1076. §. 25. 26.

(*z*) Cap. unam sanct. 1. De Major. & Obedientia. Extravag. Com.

(*a*) Bellarm. de Pont. Rom. l. 5. c. 7. §. Item; & §. sic enim.

(*b*) Conc. Lateran. sub Leo. 10. Sess. 11. apud Binium. Tom. 9. p. 153. A. B.

(*c*) Honoratus Faber Societatis Jesu, libro cui Titulus —— Una Fides, Unius Ecclesiæ Rom. Delingæ. 1657. cap. 19. *Cujus Lemma est; Claves Regni Cœlorum Duntaxat Petro Datæ fuerunt.*

(d) *Prodiit dictus Liber, cum facultate Superiorum, & Privilegio Cæsareo.*

(*e*) Dabo ait, non do; promittit, non dat. Luc. Brugensis in Matth. 16. 19. Ita etiam Faber Stapulensis in dictum locum, ut & alij. Vide Catenam Græcorum Patrum in Matthæum à Nicetâ Serrarum Episcopo Collectam; & à Balth: Corderio Jesuita Editâ Tholos. 1647. & ibi Cyril. p. 548. ubi ait, *Christum Claves Petro promisisse*. Matth. 16. 19. *Sed non dedisse*. Joh. 20. 22. 23. —— Ὁ τοῦ δώρου καιρὸς ἦν ἡ ἀφίενται αὐτοῖς, &c.

Ἀναστάσεως ὥρα, ὅτε εἶπε, λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ἄν τινων ἀφῆτε τὰς ἁμαρτίας,

3. But it is certain, that the *Power of the Keys* (be what it will) was (by our bleſſed Saviour) afterwards given to all the Apoſtles, as well, and as much, as to *Peter*. So it evidently Appears by St. (*f*) *Matthew*, in the place Cited. Where our bleſſed Saviour ſpeaking to all his Diſciples, as well as *Peter*, hath theſe words—*Verily I ſay unto You*, ('tis all (*g*) of them he ſpeaks to) *whatſoever you ſhall bind on Earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven; and whatſoever you ſhall looſe on Earth, ſhall be looſed in Heaven.* Here his Promiſe made before to *Peter*, Chap. 16. 19. is made Good to him, and the Power of the Keys given him; but 'tis manifeſt, that it is (in the ſame time and Place) equally given to all the Apoſtles, as well as to *Peter*. Their own Authentick Offices, now and heretofore in Publick uſe in the Church of *Rome*, do atteſt this truth. In one of which, they are taught to Invocate the Apoſtles in this Form—(*h*) *Orate pro eo Omnes Sancti Apoſtoli, Quibus à Domino data eſt Poteſtas Ligandi & Solvendi.* The Power of Binding and Looſing, (and ſo the Power of the Keys) was given to all the Apoſtles, as well as to *Peter*. *This the* (i) *Manual of the Church of* Salisbury *acknowledges, that the Power of binding and looſing, was given to* Paul *as well as* Peter; and further adds—(*k*) *That Every Prieſt is Vicar of* Peter *and* Paul, *and* (*Vice Petri & Pauli ligat & ſolvit*) *binds and looſeth in their ſtead and place. The* (l) *Ancient MS. Miſſal belonging to the Abbots of* Eveſham, *ſays the very ſame thing; So does* (m) *their St. Anſelme:* and the

(*f*) Matth. 18. 18.

(*g*) Τὰς κλεῖς Πέτρῳ ἔδωκε, &c. *Petro dedit Claves cum Ligandi Poteſtate; eam verò Poteſtatem tradidit & Diſcipulis Omnibus.* Procop. in Iſaiæ Cap. 61. & p. 715. 716. *Poteſtatem tribuit Apoſtolis.* Hieronym. in Matth. 18. 18. ſo even the Popiſh Commentators upon that Place; Menochius. Luc. Brugenſis, &c.

(*h*) Proceſſionale juxta Ritum Eccleſiæ Romanæ reſtitutum Pariſ. 1663. p. 205. In Commendatione Animæ.

(*i*) Manuale dictum. Londini. 1554. p. 72.

(*k*) *Quilibet Sacerdos eſt Vicarius Petri & Pauli, &c.* Ibid. p. 73.

(*l*) Miſſale dictum MS. In Formulâ Abſolutionis. p. 111. 112.

(*m*) Apud Eadmerum Hiſt. Novorum, per Seldenum lib. 1. pag. 27.

the Old (*n*) *Ordo Romanus* expreſly ſays; *That the Power of the Keys*, or the *Power of binding and looſing, was* (by our bleſſed Saviour) *given to all the Apoſtles*, and (in them) to all their Succeſſors. *Vide Bandinum, Lombardum, &c. Sent. lib.*4. *Diſt.* 18. 19. and the reſt there. Their *Trent Catechiſm* (publiſhed by Pope *Pius.* V. according to the Decree of the *Trent Council*) aſſures us, *That every* (o) *Biſhop and Prieſt has the Power of the Keys given him by our bleſſed Saviour.* Hence it is, that in their *Roman* (p) *Pontifical*, in their Ordination of a Prieſt, this *Power of the Keys, of remitting and retaining ſins, is given to every one Ordain'd to that Office*; and (which may ſeem ſtrange) *in the very* (q) *ſame words* our bleſſed Saviour uſed, when he gave that Power to *Peter* and the other Apoſtles. Nor is this all; Their Oecumenical Council of *Trent* approves and (by a Synodical Definition and Decree) confirms all this; And ſays further, *That our* (r) *bleſſed Saviour, before his Aſcention, left All Prieſts His Vicars, as Preſidents and Judges, who By the Power of the Keys, ſhould Pronounce Sentence of the Remiſſion and retaining of Sins.* And this they there prove out of this very *Place* (ſ) *of Matthew*, from which they would (and generally endeavor to) prove the *Popes* (t) *Abſolute Monarchical Supremacy, And Power to Depoſe Kings and Emperors.* To omit all other Inſtances (which are too many) ſure I am, that Pope *Innocent.* IV. builded his Power to Depoſe the Emperor *Friderick* upon this one

(*n*) Apud G. Ferrarium De Cath. Eccl. Divinis Officiis. Romæ. 1591 p. 39. in Abſolut. plurali & p. 40. In Abſolut. ſingulari. Col. 1. A. B.

(*o*) Catechiſ. Roman. Pariſ. 1635. Part. 2. c. 11. De. 10. Symboli Artic. §. 4. 6. *Dominus Epiſcopis tantum & Sacerdotibus hanc Poteſtatem dedit.* Et Idem habemus §. 9. Ibidem.

(*p*) Pontificale Romanum. Romæ. 1611. p. 52. De Ordinat. Presbyteri.

(*q*) Joh. 20. 22. 23. *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, quorum remiſſeris peccata, remittantur eis; & quorum retinueris, retenta ſunt.*

(r) *Chriſtus Aſcenſurus in Cœlos, Sacerdotes ſui Ipſius Vicarios reliquit, tanquam Præſides ac Judices, ad quos Omnia mortalia crimina deferantur; quo, Pro Poteſtate Clavium, remiſſionis & retentionis Sententiam pronuncient.* Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 14. De Pœnitentia. c. 5.

(*ſ*) Matth. 16. 19. Conc. Trident. Ibid. c. 6.

(t) *Summam Abſolutámque Poteſtatem, Supremum Caput, ſummumque Paſtorem.* Luc. Brugenſis. in locum Matth. 16. 19.

Text—(*u*) *We* (ſaith that Pope) *being Chriſt's Vicar, and it being ſaid to us, in the Perſon of* Peter, *whatſoever thou ſhalt bind on Earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven, &c. do Depoſe that Emperor, and Abſolve all His Subjects from their Oaths of Allegigance, &c.* From the Premiſſes, and Authorities above Cited, I think 'tis Evident, 1. That in that Text *Matth.* 16. 19. *The Power of the Keys*, was only promiſed, but not Actually given to *Peter*. 2. When it was really and (*de facto*) given him, *Matth.* 18. 18. It was as well, and as much given to all the other Apoſtles as to him: as (beſides what is aforeſaid) is atteſted, and expreſly affirmed by Pope (*x*) *Gregory* the Great, in his Book of the Sacraments, publiſhed by *Hugo Menardus*, a Learned *Benedictine Monck*; where Pope *Gregory* (and he as Wiſe and Learned, and as Infallible as thoſe who follow him) teaches them to pray thus; *O God, who haſt Committed the Power of Binding and Looſing To the Apoſtles, &c.* He knew not (it ſeems) any Supremacy given to *Peter* by our bleſſed Saviour, when he gave him *Poteſtatem Clavium*, The Power of the Keys; ſeeing the ſame Power was given to other Apoſtles, who never claim'd any ſuch Supremacy. 3. Laſtly, I deſire then to know, by what Logick they can prove St. *Peter's* Supremacy over all the Apoſtles, for having a Power (the Power of the Keys) which every Apoſtle had as well as He.

4. There is *one place* (y) *more* (and but one) wherein the Power of the Keys is Actually given to *Peter*; The words are theſe—*As my Father ſent me*

(u) *Nos Chriſti Vices tenentes, in terris, Nobiſque in Petri Perſonâ, dictum ſit, Quodcunque Ligaveris, &c. Imperatorem Privamus, & Subditos à Juramento fidelitatis abſolvimus.* Apud Binium. Conc. Tom. 7. Part. 2. p. 854.

(*x*) Vide Sacramentarium Gregorij Magni, per Hugonem Menardū Pariſ. 1642. p. 113. In Vigilia SS Petri & Pauli. Where they pray thus—*Deus, qui Ligandi Solvendique Licentiam Tuis Apoſtolis Commiſiſti, &c.* Barlaam de Primatu Papæ. lib. 2. Confeſſeth that the Keys were given to *Peter*—— ὐ μὴν αὐτὸς μόνῳ, &c. *Sed Non illi ſoli, ſed Pari cum Ipſo Dignitate, unicuique è duodecem.* And then he proves it from Matth. 18. 18. and Joh. 20. 22. 23. The Learned *Dan: Huetius* cites this, In Notis ad Originem. Part. 2. p. 46. Col. 1. but neither gives, nor pretends to give any Juſt Anſwer to it. Only he ſays——Barlaamum corrupit ἀλλαντικὴ ζύμη. This was eaſily ſaid, and *Barlaam* might as eaſily have anſwered, Doctiſſimum Huetium corrupit ἐρρὺς δυτικῶ.

(*y*) Joh. 20. 21. 22. 23.

me, ſo ſend I you; *And he breathed on them, and ſaid*; *Receive the Holy Ghoſt*; *whoſe ſoever ſins ye remit, they are remitted, and whoſe ſins ye retain, they are retained.* Where, 1. It is certain and confeſs'd, That though the *Power of the Keys*, be not here expreſly nam'd, yet to *retain and remit* here in *John* ſignifies the very ſame thing, That to *bind* and *looſe* in *Matthew*, where only the Power of the Keys is named. This the *Trent Catechiſm*, and the *Trent Fathers* themſelves muſt, and do acknowledge, (as will manifeſtly appear by the Places cited in the (z) Margent) and the moſt Learned Commentators on this Place in *John*, allow it, and tell us truly, (*a*) That *remittere* here in *John*, is the very ſame with *ſolvere*, to looſe, in *Matthew*; and ſo *retinere* here, the ſame with *ligare* in *Matthew*. 2. And 'tis as certain, (from the expreſs words of the Text) and the undoubted meaning of them) that the Power of the Keys is here given Equally to all the Apoſtles, as well as *Peter*; For ſo the words of their Commiſſion, *I ſend You* (mine Apoſtles) *and he Breathed on Them*; (his Apoſtles) *whoſe ſins Ye* (my Apoſtles) *retain*, &c. The Authority and Power here mention'd, is (without diſtinction or difference of Degree) Equally given to all; to *James*, and *John*, and *Jude*, as well as *Peter*. 3. Nay more; it is (*b*) *Confeſs'd*, and poſitively and truly affirm'd, by a very Learned Popiſh Author, That all the Apoſtles (as well as *Peter*) are by this Commiſſion *Vicars* and *Succeſſors* of Chriſt,

(z) Vide Catechiſm. Trident. Part. 1. cap. 11. §. 4. et. loca in Margine notata, in Edit. Pariſ. 1635. p. 129. & Ibid. §. 9. p. 132. & Part. 2. cap. 5. De Pœnitent. §. 12. p. 309. 310. & Ibidem §. 55. p. 339. 340. & Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 14. De Pœnitentiâ. cap. 5. & 6.

(a) *Remittuntur eis, verè & reipſâ Judicio meo Patriſque Cœleſtis, Soluta ſunt in Cœlo; quomodo loquitur* Matth. 16. 19. Luc. Brugenſis in Joh. 20. 23. Comment. Tom. 4. pag. 134. Vid. Catenam Græc. Patrum in Johan. per Corderium, ad Joh. 20. 23. p. 459. And *Ammonius* there.

(b) *Ego, filius Dei, perfunctus Vicibus meis, mitto Æquali Authoritate in Mundum Univerſum, vos, quos creavi Apoſtolos meos,* ——— *Ordino vos Succeſſores meos* ——— *Quod ait Euthymius, Chryſoſtomum ſecutus* ——— *Apoſtoli tanquam Legati ac Vicarij Chriſti, ſuſtinentes Perſonam ipſius abſentis.* Luc. Brugenſis in Joh. 20. 21. Commentariorum in. 4. Evangelia. Tom. 4. pag. 172.

Chriſt, and have the Power of the Keys (to *bind* and *looſe*, *retain* and *remit* ſins) Equally given to them All. Now, if this be true, then it will inevitably follow, That all the Arguments they uſually bring to prove the Pope's Monarchical Supremacy (even over Kings and Emperors) becauſe he was Chriſt's Vicar, and had the Power of the Keys given him; I ſay, All ſuch Arguments, from ſuch Topicks, will not only be inconſequent, but indeed altogether impertinent and ridiculous. For if this Argument be good and concluding, *The Keys were given to* Peter, *and he is the Vicar of Chriſt:* Ergo, *He is the ſole Supream Monarch of the whole Church.* Then this will be as good and concluding—*Every Apoſtle* (as well as *Peter*) *was the Vicar of Chriſt, and had the Keys given him:* Ergo, *Every Apoſtle was ſole Supream Monarch of the whole Church.* And then (by this wild Logick) we ſhall have Twelve or Thirteen Perſons, *and every one of them ſole Supream Monarch of the whole Church.* That the Power of the Keys, was by our bleſſed Saviour, given to All the Apoſtles as well as *Peter*, ſeems to me Evident by the Premiſſes, and that all of them (as much and as well as He) were *Chriſti Vicarij*, *Chriſt's Vicars*, may be as Evident, and muſt be Confeſs'd, even by our Adverſaries; unleſs they will deny the plain Truth of Scripture, and their own received Principles. For, 1. Our bleſſed Saviour tells us—*As my* (c) *Father ſent me, ſo ſend I you.* Chriſt was our great (*d*) Apoſtle ſent immediately

(c) Joh. 20.21.
(*d*) Hebr. 3.1.

ately by his Father, ſo that he was *Legatus & Vicarius Patris*, his Father's *Vicar* and *Ambaſſador* (as St. (*e*) *Ambroſe* ſays) And our bleſſed Saviour ſends his Apoſtles, as his *Vicars and Ambaſſadors*. So the ſame Father tells us, in *the* (*f*) *ſame place*; and St. *Paul* ſays as much of (*g*) *himſelf* and the other Apoſtles —*He hath Committed to us the Word of Reconciliation; now then We are Ambaſſadors, for Chriſt, as though God did beſeech you by us; we pray you in Chriſts's ſtead.* All the Apoſtles were (by our bleſſed Saviour) Commiſſion'd and ſent as his Ambaſſadors, what they did was in *Chriſt's ſtead* and *place*. They were his *Vicars*, and what they did was as his Depuries, *Vice-Chriſti*, ſupplying his place. Thus (*h*) *Lyranus*, and the *Interlinatory* (i) *Gloſſator*, (and they no *Lutherans*) Explain that place; ſo the Famous Biſhop of *Paris*, and Father of the School-men, *Peter* (k) *Lombard*; ſo Pope (*l*) *Gregory* the Great; nay the Jeſuits (*Inſtituta Societat. Jeſu. Tom. 3. pag. 262. 263.* acknowledge their Superiors (though they be neither Popes nor Apoſtles) to be *Vicarios Chriſti, Chriſt's Vicars*. And that I may neither trouble the Reader, nor my ſelf with more Teſtimonies; Their own Authentick Offices, which have been, or are Approved, and publickly uſed in their Church, expreſly ſay the very ſame thing; That the Apoſtles (All of them as well as *Peter*) were *Chriſt's Vicars*; particularly, the preſent *Roman*

(e) *Deus erat in Chriſto, quaſi in Vicario & Legato.* Ambroſ. in. 2. Cor. 5. 19. Explicat. Ambroſ. Cap. 16.

(f) *Deus pro Chriſto Vicarios dedit Apoſtolos, ut Pro Ipſo prædicarent reconciliationem.* Idem ibidem.

(g) 2 Cor. 5. 19. 20.

(h) *Obſecramus pro Chriſto*; i. e. *Loco Chriſti, cujus ſumus Miniſtri.* Lyranus in locum. 2. Cor. 5. 20.

(i) *Miniſterium reconciliationis dedit nobis*; i.e. *Vicariis Apoſtolis*; And again, *Legatione fungimur pro Chriſto*; i.e. *Vice Chriſti.*

(k) *Dedit quoſdam Apoſtolos*; i.e. *Vicarios Prædicationis ſuæ.* Lombard. in Eph. 4. pag. 171. & rurſus in. 2. Cor. 5. 19. 20. *Dedit Miniſterium reconciliationis nobis Apoſtolis, Vicariis Chriſti.* pag. 125. Col. E.

(l) Vide Johan. Lanoium Epiſt. Tom. 6. pag. 292.

man (*m*) *Miſſal*, as does manifeſtly appear by the place quoted in the Margent. This then being certain, and (by our Adverſaries) Confeſs'd, That every Apoſtle (as well as *Peter*) was *Chriſt's Vicar*, and had *the Power of the Keys given him* by our bleſſed Saviour, at the ſame time, and in the *very ſame* (n) *words* when and wherein they were given to *Peter:* I ſay, this being granted (as it is, and muſt) it will be abſolutely impoſſible for them to prove any Superiority in *Peter* (much leſs a Monarchical Supremacy) over the other Apoſtles, from his Title of *Chriſt's Vicar*, or *the Power of the Keys*, both which every Apoſtle had as well and as much as He, unleſs you will ſay, That very Power which only makes *Peter* Equal to the reſt, makes him their Monarch and Superior. Sure I am, if this Argument be good (and they have no better) *Peter is Chriſt's Vicar, and has the Power of the Keys:* Ergo, *he is Superior to* John. Then this will be good too— *John is Chriſt's Vicar, and has the Power of the Keys:* Ergo, *He is Superior to* Peter. But enough (if not too much) of this. For the Arguments they bring for the Popes Supremacy, drawn from his being *Chriſt's Vicar*, and having *the Power of the Keys*, are ſuch as rather deſerve pity, or ſcorn, then any ſerious Anſwer, were it not that their greateſt men (for Place and Learning,

(*m*) Vid. Miſſale Roman. ex Decreto Concilij Trident. reſtitutum, Pij. 5. Juſſu Editum. Clement. 8. Authoritate recognitum; Antv. 1619. Inter Præfationes Miſſæ ſine notis. p. 219. ubi in Præfat. De Apoſtolis, Sic Orant— *Æquum eſt Te Domine ſupplicitèr exorare, ut gregem tuum, Paſtor æterne, non deſeras, ſed per Apoſtolos tuos, continuâ protectione Cuſtodias; ut iiſdem Rectoribus gubernatur, quos operis Tui Vicarios eidem Contuliſti præeſſe Paſtores.* Hanc Orationem iiſdem plane verbis conceptam, habes in Miſſali ſecundum uſum Yorke, inter Præfationes Miſſales, in Calce Tom. 1. & in Miſſali ſecundum uſum Eccleſiæ Salisburienſis. Inter Præfationes Miſſales. And *Guil: Eſtius* the Learned Profeſſor and Chancellor of the Univerſity of *Doway*, expreſly approves, and confirms this; in his Comment. on the 2. Cor. 5. 20. *Poſtquam Sublatus eſt Chriſtus in Cœlum, Nos (Apoſtoli) Illius Vices Gerimus in terrâ. Deus igitur primus Author, Chriſtus Miniſter principalis, Nos (Apoſtoli) Miniſtri ſecundarij, atque Vicarij, A Deo & Chriſto Miſſi.*

(*n*) Matth. 18. 18. Joh. 20. 22. 23.

Learning, even (o) *their Infallible Popes* in their Authentick Bulls) perpetually urge them, to prove *the Pope Superior to Kings and Emperors*, and to have (what Pope *Pius.* V. in This Impious Bull againſt Queen *Elizabeth* pretends to) Power to Depoſe them, and Abſolve Subjects from all Oaths of Allegiance and Fidelity. The Premiſes conſidered, I think it is Evident, and (I doubt not but) Impartial and Intelligent men think ſo too:

(o) So Pope *Bonif.* 8. urges that Place, Matth. 16. 19. *Quodcunque Ligaveris, &c.* Cap. unam Sanctam. 1. De Major. & Obed. Extrav. Commun. And *Innocent.* 4. Juſtifies his Depoſing the Emperor, (as is aforeſaid) from thoſe words —— *Quodcunque Ligaveris*, and the Power given to *Peter* and the Pope by them. Binius Concil. Tom. 7. Part. 2. pag. 854. Edit. Pariſ. 1636. And *Gregory.* 7. cites the ſame Place, to the ſame purpoſe. Lib. 8. Epiſt. 21. And the ſame *Gregory* grounds his Excommunication of the Emperor *Hen.* 4. upon the Power of the Keys. *Mihi eſt Poteſtas data Ligandi in Cœlo & Terrâ. Hac Ideo Fiduciâ Fretus, Henrico totius Regni Teutonicorum & Italiæ gubernacula Contradico, & Omnes Chriſtianos à vinculo Juramenti, quod ſibi fecere, aut facient, abſolvo.* Baronius Annal. Tom. 11. Ad Ann. 1076. §§. 25. 26.

1. That every Apoſtle, as well as *Peter*, was *Chriſt's Vicar*, and had the *Power of the Keys Committed to him*, by our bleſſed Saviour, and that *Immediately* without *Any dependence on Peter*, or any other; Sure I am, that Cardinal *Cuſanus* (though a zealous Aſſertor of the Pope's Supremacy) was convinc'd of this Truth (as to St. *Paul*, and ſo he might for the Reſt) and does *in Terminis* Acknowledge it. He ſays, *That both* Peter *and* Paul were (p) *Eccleſiæ Principes*, Princes of the Catholick Church; *That they* (*both of them*) *had the* (q) *Power of the Keys, power to bind and looſe*; and both of them had it (r) *Immediately* from our bleſſed

(p) *Petrus & Paulus ambo Principes.* Card. Cuſanus. Epiſt. 2. De uſu Communionis ad Bohemoſ. Operum. p. 836. Edit. Baſil. 1565.

(q) *Nec Myſterio caret, Romanum Pontificem. Authoritate Petri & Pauli Ligare & Solvere.* Idem ibid.

(r) *De utriuſque tam Petri inter Judæos, quam Pauli inter Gentes Primatu, Immediate à Chriſto Utrique Collato.* And this he proves, out of *Ambroſe* on the *Galat.* 2. 7. who ſays the ſame thing. Idem ibidem.

Saviour; That as *Peter* was (*ſ*) *Primate*, as to the *Jews*; ſo *Paul* was *Primate* as to the *Gentiles*; and ſo, that (in this Primacy) *Peter* was not ſubject to *Paul*, nor (*t*) *Paul to Peter*, but each of them had that *Primacy Immediately from Chriſt*, without any dependence on each other. And this *Cuſanus* there proves out of *Ambroſe*, *Auguſtine* and *Hierome*.

2. And as every Apoſtle, as well as *Peter*, was *Vicar of Chriſt*, and had *the Power of the Keys*; ſo it appears by the Premiſes, and is *Confeſs'd by our Adverſaries* (in the Places before Cited) that all of them transferred that Title and Power to their Succeſſors; ſo *that every Biſhop*, and every Prieſt, after the Apoſtles, is *Chriſt's* (u) *Vicar*, and has the Power of the Keys. Whence it Evidently follows, that the Biſhops of *Rome* (notwithſtanding their great Noiſe, and groundleſs pretence to the contrary) are no more our bleſſed Saviour's Vicars, nor have any more Power of the Keys, then any, (I ſay again, then any) other Biſhop in the World; The Pope and Biſhop of *Rome* no more, then the Biſhops of *Roan* and *Rocheſter*. For their own Oecumenical and (with them) Infallible Council of *Trent*, aſſures us of two things. 1. That all Biſhops are (*x*) *Apoſtolorum Succeſſores*, Succeſſors of the Apoſtles. 2. That our bleſſed Saviour, when he was about to Aſcend into Heaven, (*y*) left *Sacerdotes* (that (*z*) is Biſhops and other Prieſts) his *Vicars*, *Vicarij Chriſti*. And refer to the. 14. Seſſ. c. 5. before Cited. In Edit. and

(*ſ*) *Potuit utrique ubiq; Eccleſias fundare, tam in Circumciſione, quam præputio; Licet Principalis Commiſſio cum Primatu, Petri fuerit in Circumciſione, & Pauli in Præputio.* Idem ibidem.

(*t*) *Nec in hoc Alter Alteri Suberat, ſed Ambo ſub Chriſto Immediate.* Idem ibidem.

(*u*) *Cyprian* ſays, That the Biſhop is —— *Judex Vice Chriſti*; and that the Biſhops, *Apoſtolis Vicariâ Ordinatione ſuccedunt.* This *Rigaltius* obſerves; And adds, *Ecce Epiſcopos, ævo jam Cypriani, Vicarios Chriſti.* Rigalt. Obſervat. in Epiſt. Cypr. p. 73. And a little after, —— *Epiſcopus eſt Dei Sacerdos, & Vicarius Chriſti.*

(*x*) *Synodus declarat Epiſcopos, qui in* Apoſtolorum *locum ſucceſſerunt.* Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 23. De Sacramento Ordin. c. 4.

(*y*) *Chriſtus Aſcenſurus, Sacerdotes ſui Ipſius Vicarios reliquit, &c.* Con. Trid. Seſſ. 14. De Pœnit. c. 5. de Confeſſione.

(*z*) Vid. Ibid. c. 6. De Miniſt. Sacramenti Pœnitent. where it is evident, that by *Sacerdotes*, c. 5. all Biſhops & Prieſts are meant; And that it ſhould be ſure that they are meant, in the Index of that Council theſe words are expreſly ſet down, ---*Sacerdotes ſunt* Conc. Trid. Antv. 1633.

and gave them the *Power of the Keys, to bind and looſe, to remit and retain ſins.* To conclude this Point; If the Pope and his Party, have no better ground in Scripture, (then the Places above mention'd,) to prove and ſupport that vaſt Papal Supremacy, they moſt vainly and irrationally pretend to; the whole Fabrick muſt of neceſſity fall. It being impoſſible that ſo vaſt a Superſtruction as their Popiſh Monarchy ſhould be ſo ſuſtain'd, by ſuch Reaſons which are ſo far from being Cogent, that they are altogether Impertinent.

Object.

Well; but if theſe will not prove (what they are produc'd for) the Popes Supremacy; other Texts they bring, with as much Noiſe and Confidence as they did the former, and (if that be poſſible) with leſs Reaſon or Conſequence. For Inſtance, they Cite (to prove the Pope's Supremacy over the whole Church, even over all the other Apoſtles) *Joh.* 21. 15 16.17. *Paſce Oves meas, Feed my Sheep.* And tell us—(*a*) *That our bleſſed Saviour leaving the World, did create* Peter *his Vicar, and higheſt Prieſt, and Prince of the Univerſal Church, which he had promiſed before,* Matth. 16. 18, *and now perform'd that promiſe.* And again (they ſay)—(*b*) *It appears from this place, That* Peter (*and his Succeſſors Popes of* Rome) *is Head and Prince of the Church, and that all the Faithful, even the Apoſtles are made Subjects to him, to be fed and ruled by him.* This place is urged by Pope *Innocent* the Third to the like (though God knows little) purpoſe: who would have us underſtand by thoſe words,

(a) *Chriſtus in Cœlum abiturus, hic ſuum creatum Vicarium deſignat ac ſummum Pontificem creat Petrum; Promiſerat Chriſtus Id Ipſum Petro.* Matth. 16. 18. *Sed hoc loco præſtat; eumque Principem & Paſtorem Totius Eccleſiæ Conſtituit.* Corn. A Lapide in Joh. 21. 15. pag. 546.

(b) *Ex hoc loco patet S. Petrum (& Ejus Succeſſores Rom. Pontifices) eſſe Caput & Principem Eccleſiæ, Omnéſque fideles, & jam Apoſtolos ipſi Subjici, & ab eo paſci & Regi debere.* Idem ibid. pag. 547. Col. 2.

words, *Feed my Sheep*; that our *bleſſed Saviour* (c) *meant all his Sheep, all good Chriſtians. That he might ſhew,* (ſays that Pope) *that they were none of our bleſſed Saviours Sheep, who would not Acknowledge* Peter *and the Popes of* Rome *to be their Maſters and Paſtors.* And (to name no more) Pope *Boniface.* VIII. indeavours to prove, that our bleſſed Saviour by thoſe words, *Feed my Sheep, meant Univerſally all his Sheep* (d) — *becauſe he does not ſay ſingularly theſe or thoſe, but generally Feed my Sheep: And from this Place ſo Expounded, they would prove* Peter's, *and ſo the Pope's Monarchical Supremacy over all Chriſtians, even the Apoſtles, Kings, and Emperors.*

1. Were it not certain, that there is no poſſibility that any man ſhould bring a true and concluding Reaſon to prove an erroneous and falſe Poſition; it would hardly be credible that otherwiſe Learned men, furniſhed with great Parts of Art and Nature, ſhould bring ſuch miſerable Stuff, ſuch miſapply'd and miſunderſtood Scripture, to prove that great (e) *Article* of their Popes Supremacy; which being a manifeſt Errour, without any Foundation in Scripture or Primitive Antiquity, I cannot blame them, for not bringing (what they neither have, nor can have) better Arguments; but that they bring any at all, to eſtabliſh that, which they ought, and with evident and cogent Reaſons, might confute.

2. As Antiquity did, ſo we do grant (all that with any Reaſon or Juſt ground they can deſire) that *Peter* had a Primacy of Order (but not of Power

(c) *Ait Chriſtus Petro & Succeſſoribus: Paſce Oves meas; non diſtinguens inter has oves & alias: ut alienum à ſuo ovili demonſtraret, qui Petrum & Succeſſores Ipſius, Magiſtros non recognoſceret & Paſtores.* Cap. Solicit. 6. Extrav. de Majorit. & Obedientiâ.

(d) *Paſce Oves, inquit, & generaliter non ſingulariter has vel illas: per quod Commiſiſſe ſibi Intelligitur Univerſas.* Cap. unam Sanctam. 1. De Major. & Obedientiâ. Extrav. Commun. Ita. Tirinus Reliquique paſſim. in Joh. 21. 15.

Anſwer.

(e) The Popes Supremacy conſiſts in this, that he is, *Petri Succeſſor, & Chriſti verus & legitimus in terris Vicarius.* Catechiſ. Trid. Part. 2. c. 7. §. 28. p. 391. Edit. Pariſ. 1635. And this an Article of their Creed, (I mean their new Creed) to which they ſwear (all who have any Dignities, Cure of Souls, &c. Vide Bullam Pij Papæ 4. Super forma profeſſionis fidei in Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 24. De Reformat. poſt. cap. 12. Edit. Antverp. 1633.

Power or Juriſdiction) amongſt the Apoſtles. For the Evangeliſt naming the Apoſtles, (*f*) ſays— *The Firſt was Peter.* Firſt in Order, or (if you will) firſt *reſpectu vocationis*; as firſt call'd by our bleſſed Saviour; not to be one of his Diſciples; for ſo *Andrew* was call'd before him (as is evident in the (*g*) Text) but in reſpect of his Call to be an Apoſtle. For when, out of his Diſciples he choſe Twelve to be his Apoſtles, *Matthew* (in the Place Cited) ſaith; *The firſt was Peter.* So we grant to the Biſhop of *Rome* (what anciently was given him) a *Primacy of Order*, and Precedency, before all the Biſhops in the *Roman Empire*; But not *Jure Divino*, by Divine Right (which without all Reaſon, (*h*) they pretend to) but by the Conſent of the Ancient Fathers and Councils. And for this, we have the Synodical Definition and Declaration of Six hundred and thirty Fathers in an Ancient and received General Council; who ſaid—(*i*) *That becauſe old* Rome *was the Imperial City, therefore the Fathers had rightly given Priviledges to the Epiſcopal Seat of that City.* Where it is evident, that in the Judgment of that great and good Council, (and of the General Council of (*k*) *Conſtantinople* too, which they there Cite.) 1. That the Priviledge and Precedency the Biſhop of *Rome* had, was not Convey'd to him *by any Divine Right* (as they now pretend) *non à Chriſto vel Petro, ſed à Patribus*; it was the Fathers who gave them. 2. And the Reaſon why they gave him ſuch Priviledge, and Precedency, was not becauſe he was *Chriſt's Vicar* and St. *Peter's Succeſſor*, but

(*f*) Matth. 10.2.

(*g*) Joh. 1. 40. 41. 42.

(*h*) Catechiſ. Trid. in the Place and Section laſt Cited, ſays—— *Romanus Pontifex eſt Epiſcoporum Maximus*; *Idque Jure Divino.* Thats the Lemma to that Section. And then 'tis added, That the Supream Juriſdiction of the Pope, *Nullis Synodicis, aut Humanis Conſtitutionibus, ſed Divinitùs data eſt.*

(*i*) Καὶ γὰρ τῷ θρόνῳ. &c. *Etenim Antiquæ Romæ Throno, quod Urbs illa Imperaret, Jure Patres Privilegia dederunt.* Conc. Chalcedon. Can. 28. Apud Bin. Tom. 3. p. 446.

(*k*) Conc. Conſt. 1. Can. 5. apud bin. Conc. Tom. 1. pag. 661. *Epiſcopus Conſtantinopolitanus habere debet Primatûs Honorem Poſt Romanum Epiſcopum, quia Civitas illa eſt nova Roma.*

but because *Rome* was *Urbs Imperialis*, the great Metropolis of the *Roman Empire*. I know the Popes Legats in that Council, did what they could to hinder the passing that Canon, and Pope *Leo* out of it, (when the Canon was passed) did oppose it, as much as he was able, but in vain. For the Canon was *Synodically passed*, by the Concurrent Consent of the whole (*l*) Council, (the Popes Legats excepted, which was acknowledg'd by the (*m*) Judges, and then (*n*) Confirm'd by the Emperor, and Received into the *Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Universæ*. That which troubled the Pope, was, that *Constantinople* should have *Equal Priviledges* with *Rome* (Precedency only excepted) even in all *Ecclesiastical business*; and that (by the Canon of that great Council, and Confirmation of the Emperor) the Patriarch of *Constantinople* should have so vast a Territory under his Jurisdiction, to wit, Three whole Dioceses, (*Thracica*, *Asiana*, *Pontica*,) more then (by any Law of God or Man) the Pope ever had under him. And 'tis here observeable, that although this Canon (giving Equal Priviledges to the Bishop of *Constantinople*, as to him of *Old Rome* (Precedency only excepted) absolutely deny'd that Monarchical Supremacy and Jurisdiction over all Patriarchs, (which the Popes were then nibling at, and have since openly own'd) yet *Leo* in his Epistles to the (*o*) Emperor, (*p*) *Anatolius*, (*q*) *Pulchoria Augusta*, *&c.* wherein he writes fiercely against this Canon, never pretended (as afterwards, and now they do) That *the Bishops of* Rome *had by Divine* (r) *Right*, (as

(*l*) Vid. Binium Conc. Tom. 3. Edit. Paris. 1636. pag. 461. & pag. 464. Ἐπίσκοποι ἐβόησαν, αὕτη δικαία ψῆφος, ταῦτα πάντες λέγομεν, ταῦτα πᾶσιν ἀρέσκει, &c.

(m) Οἱ ἐνδοξότατοι Ἄρκοντες εἶπον, ὅσα διαλαλήσαμεν πάντα ἡ Σύνοδος ἐκύρωσε. Binius ibidem. p. 463. E. F. & 464. D.

(*n*) Vide Edictum Valentiniani & Marciani. Ibid. pag. 476. 477. Ἅπαντες Τοίνυν, &c. Universi ideo quæ à *Synodo Chalcedonensi Constituta sunt, Custodire debent*. Et vide ibid. p. 477 478. Edictum Marciani, de Confirmatione Synodi Chalcedonensis.

(*o*) Binius ibid. Conc. Tom. 3. p. 480.

(*p*) Ibid. pag. 479.

(*q*) Ibid. pag. 481.

(r) So Pope *Nicol.* 1. tells us, That *Primatûs Sedis Romanæ non à Patribus, aut Imperiali Civitate, sed à Christo & Beato Petro*. Vid. Binium Conc. Tom. 6. p. 508. Col. 2. F. Edit. Paris. 1636. & pag. 513. Col. 2. C. So the Trent. Catechis. part. 2. cap. 7. §. 28. Papa Rom. Suprematum habet—— *Non ullis Synodicis, aut humanis Constitutionibus, sed Divinitùs*, &c. See the Authorities they there urge for it. p. 391. Edit. Paris. 1635.

(as Vicars of our bleſſed Saviour) *a Supream Juriſdiction over all Biſhops and Patriarchs in the whole World:* but complains of *Anatolius* (*f*) *his pride*, (*Catalina Cethegum*) the Violation of the *Nicene Canons*, and the wrong done to the Patriarchs of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*. To talk of ſuch a Monarchical Supremacy then, as the Popes have ſince pretended to; Pope *Leo* neither did, nor durſt; it was a Doctrine unheard of in thoſe purer times; and had he challenged it then, as due to him by *Divine Right*, as he was *Chriſt's Vicar*, he would have made himſelf Odious, and (having no ground for ſuch a Challenge) ridiculous to the Chriſtian World. But when (notwithſtanding all his Legates could do in the Council, or he out of it) the Canon paſs'd, by the Unanimous Conſent of the Council, and was Confirm'd by the Imperial and Supream Power of the Emperor; (for the Pope does Petition and (*t*) Supplicate to him as his Superior) though the Pope in a Private Epiſtle to *Pulcheria Auguſta* (with great Inſolence, and without any Ground) pretends to (*u*) Caſſate and null that Canon by the Authority of St. *Peter*, (who never had any ſuch Authority to Null any Juſt Imperial or Synodical Conſtitutions) yet that Canon was approved, received, and (as *de Jure* it ought) Obey'd by the *Eaſtern Churches*, both then, and ever (*x*) after. When theſe Pretenſions of the Pope and his Legats prevailed not, nor were regarded by the Council, or Emperor, or the Eaſtern Church; other Arts were uſed at *Rome*, to Conceal that Canon (which they could not Caſſate)

(*f*) Apud Binium ubi ſupra. pag. 479. E.

(t) *Clementiam veſtram Precor, & Sedulâ Suggeſtione Obſecro, &c.* Ita Leo Papa in Epiſt. Marciano Imperatori, Apud Binium. Conc. Tom. 3. p. 481. Col. 1. B.

(u) *Conſenſiones Epiſcoporum* (even thoſe in the General Council at *Chalcedon* he means) *in irritum mittimus, & per Authoritatem Beati Petri, Generali Definitione Caſſamus.* Leo Papa in Epiſt. ad Pulcheriam, apud Binium. Tom. 3. p. 482. B.

(*x*) It was *in terminis* Confirm'd in the ſixth General Council at *Conſtantinople*. Can. 36. And the ſecond General Council at *Conſtantinople*. Can. 5. gives the ſame precedence to the Biſhop of *Byzantium*, which the Council of *Chalcedon* does.

Cassate) from the knowledge of the *Western Church.* And to this end, 1. They Corrupt the *Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Universalis* (the most Authentick Book, next to the Bible, the Christian Church has, or ever had) (*y*) *Dionysius Exiguus* a Roman-Abbot, begins that Impious Work; and in his *Latin Translation* of that *Code* (amongst other things) leaves out that Eight and twentieth Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon*, and (*z*) others of the Popish Party, follow him. 2. They *Corrupt the* (a) *Canon it self*; and by putting in other words in their false Translation, they make it contradict the *Greek Canon*, and the certain Sense of the Council that made it. So in *Gratian*, the Corruptions of this Canon, are thus—

1. For ἴσα πρεσβεῖα (*æqualia Privilegia*) in the Original Greek; *Gratian* has *Similia Privilegia*; *like*, but not *equal* Priviledges.
2. For Πρεσβυτέρα Ῥώμη, (*Senior Roma*) *Gratian* has *Superior Roma*—*Old Rome* must be Superior to *New Rome*, or *Constantinople*, if Forgery and Falsification of Records can do it: for better Grounds they have none.
3. For, καὶ ἐν τοῖς Ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς, *etiam in Ecclesiasticis magnificetur ut illa.* *Gratian* impudently reads, *Non Tamen in Ecclesiasticis*, &c.

But notwithstanding all that Pope *Leo* or his Legats could do, and all their other Indirect Arts afterwards, this Eight and twentieth Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon* was received in the Christian World,

(*y*) Dionysius Exiguus Abbas-Romanus sub Justiniano, Circa An. 540. as Trithemius, or. 520. as others.

(*z*) So Isiodor. Jac. Merlinus. Paris. 3535. Codex Canonum vetus Eccl. Romanæ. Edit. 2. Mogunt. 1525. dein Paris. 1619. Editio Latina prisca Canonum, Apud Justell. Biblioth. Tom. 1. p. 300. So Pet Crabb. Joverius. Joh. Sichardus. Post Opera D. Clement. Paris. 1568. &c.

(*a*) Can Renovantes. 6. Dist. 22. *Petimus, ut Constantinopolitana Sedes Similia Privilegia, quæ Superior Roma habet, accipiat; Non tamen in Ecclesiasticis rebus magnificetur ut illa, &c.* So Gratian in the Old Editions, as is Confess'd. Vid. Corpus Jur. Can. Cum Glossis. Paris. 1612. & sine Glossis. Paris. 1618. & ibi Notas ad hunc Canonem.

World, and long after Confirmed by General Councils, not only by the *Synodus 6. Generalis*, which was held *Anno* 681. (of which a little before) But the Eighth General Council under Pope *Adrian.* II. about the Year 870. gives that (*b*) Precedency to the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, which the Canon of *Chalcedon* before gave him; And this acknowledged and referred into the Body of their (*c*) Canon Law, in the beſt Editions of it, Reviſed and Corrected by Pope (*d*) *Gregory.*XIII. And 'tis to be obſerved, that this *Synodus.* 8. was Subſcribed by the Pope or his Legats there, and was then, and ſtill is approved and received at *Rome:* Nor need we wonder at it, For what it did, was carried chiefly by the Popes Authority, who was by that Council, baſely and ſervilly flatter'd; they Calling him *Moſt* (*e*) *Holy and Oecumenical Pope, and Equal to the Angels, &c.* This Title *Oecumenical*, the Pope took kindly then, though his Predeceſſor (*f*) *Gregory* the Great abhorr'd it, as *Antichriſtian.* But to return to the Objection.

3. And here before I give a Particular and Diſtinct Anſwer to this Place of *John*, (*Feed my Sheep*) on which they commonly (and vainly) build the Popes Supremacy; I ſhall crave leave, a little to Explain, the nature and meaſure of that Power which they give the Pope under the name of his Supremacy. And here they ſay, *That our bleſſed Saviour gave His own Power to* Peter, *made him his Vicar, Head and Paſtor of all the Faithful in the World; and that in moſt ample Words, when he bad him,*

(b) *Definimus neminem Mundi Potentum, quemquam qui Patriarchalibus præſunt Sedibus, in honorare præcipuè ſanctiſſimum Papam Senioris Romæ; deinceps autem Conſtantinopoleos Patriarcham, deinde Alexandriæ, &c.* Ita Synodus. 8. habita ſub Adriano Papa. Can. 21. And this an approved Council at *Rome.*

(*c*) Gratian. Can. Definimus. 7. Diſt. 22. Vid. Gloſſam Ibid.

(*d*) Vid. Bullam Greg. 13. dat. Romæ. 1. Julij 1580. Juri Canonico præfixam. Edit. Pariſ. 1612. & 1618.

(*e*) Τῷ κυρίῳ ἁγιωτάτῳ, μεγίστῳ Ἀρχιερεῖ τῆς Οἰκουμενικῆς Πάπᾳ Ἀδριανῷ. In Epiſt. Synod. 8. ad Adrianum. Apud Binium Conc. Tom. 7. Part. 1. p 984.

(*f*) Vid. Greg. Maj. Regiſt. l. 4. Epiſt. 32. & 34. 36. 38. & l. 6. Epiſt. 30. & l. 7. Epiſt. 30. pag 220.

him, Feed his Sheep, and that it was our bleſſed Saviours Will, that all Peter's *Succeſſors ſhould have the very ſame Power, which* Peter *had*; (ſo the *Trent* (g) *Catechiſm* tells us) And this is that Plenitude of Power by which they Erroneouſly and Impiouſly Depoſe Kings and Emperors, and (as *Pius.* V. does, in this Bull, we are now ſpeaking of, againſt Queen *Elizabeth*) abſolve their Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance, and ſworn or natural Fidelity. This premiſed, I ſhall proceed to a direct (and I hope a full and ſatisfying) Anſwer to that place in *John, Feed my Sheep:* &c. And here I conſider,

1. That, if the Supremacy was *firſt given to Peter*, in thoſe words —(*h*) *Paſce Oves, Feed my Sheep*, (as is confeſs'd, and by our Adverſaries poſitively affirm'd in the Objection) which was after our bleſſed Saviours Reſurrection: then it is Evident he had it not before: It being impoſſible he ſhould have it before it was given him. And then it will as Evidently follow, that all thoſe Places in the Goſpel, ſpoken of, or to *Peter*, before our bleſſed Saviour's Paſſion, are Impertinently urged to prove *Peter*'s Supremacy, which he had not till after the Reſurrection. And yet *Innocent.* III. *Boniface.* VIII. and other Popes in their Bulls and Papal Conſtitutions, the Canoniſts, School-men, and Commentators uſually Cite *many places* in the Goſpel (beſides this, *Paſce Oves*) to prove that *Peter* had the Supremacy before our bleſſed Saviour's Paſſion; which here they Confeſs was not given him till after the

(g) *Salvator Noſter Petrum ſuæ Poteſtatis Vicarium præfecit; & Univerſi Fidelium generis Caput & Paſtorem Conſtituit, cum illi Oves ſuas paſcendas, Verbis Ampliſſimis Commendavit; ut qui ei ſucceſſit, Eandem planè Totius Eccleſiæ Regendæ Poteſtatem habere voluerit.* Catechiſ. Trid. ex Decreto Conc. Trid. à Pio. 5. Editus. Part. 1. c.10. §:13. p. 117. Edit. Pariſ. 1634. Vid. N. Rigaltij Obſervat. Galeatam, Notis ſuis in Cyprianum præfixam.

(*h*) John 21. 15.16.

the Reſurrection. That they do urge many ſuch Places is known to all Learned men, vers'd in theſe Controverſies; but if any man doubt of it, and deſire Satisfaction, I ſhall refer him to what a Learned Popiſh Writer (and *Capucine*) has ſaid in the (*i*) Margent, where he tells us, how many places are Cited for the Supremacy.

(*i*) Vide Epitomen Canon. &c. per Greg. De Rives Capucinum. Lugd. 1603. Tract. de Primatu, p. 3. 4. where for *Peter*'s Supremacy, he cites Matth. 16. 17. 18. 19. *Super hanc Petram: & dabo Tibi Claves:* Matth. 10. 2. *Primus Petrus.* Matth. 17. 27. *Chriſt paid Tribute only for himſelf and Peter.* Joh. 1. 43. *Thou ſhalt be called Cephas.* Joh. 21. 7. 8. *Peter alone caſt himſelf into the Sea.* Matth. 14. 28. He calls *Peter* only to come to him; *Et ita Unicum ſe Chriſti Vicarium deſignavit.* Matth. 18. 21. Matth. 19. 27. Mark. 14. 37. He ſaid only to *Peter*, *Simon ſleepeſt thou.* Others Cite for *Peter*'s Supremacy, Luk. 22. 38. *Here are two Swords.* So Pope *Bonif.* 8. Cap. Unam Sanctam. 1. Extrav. Commun. vide Gloſſam. verbo, Cœleſtis. Can. Omnes. 1. Diſt. 22. Though their proofs from all thoſe Places, (and they have no better) are not only Inconſequent, and Erroneous, but indeed Ridiculous. Vid. Tho. Campegium, Epiſc. Feltrenſem, De Poteſtate Romani Pontificis. Venet. 1555. Cap. 4. 5. Opus Paulo. 4. Papæ dedicat. ubi loca hæc & plura, ad probandum Papæ Suprematum, vanè adducit, & ridicule explicat. vid. etiam Bellarmin. De Romano Pontif. lib. 1. cap. 10. 11. 12. & inde ad cap. 24. Incluſive.

2. When our bleſſed Saviour ſays, *Paſce Oves*, *Feed my Sheep*, and *Feed my Lambs*; he uſeth two words — ποίμαινε and βόσκε. Both which words the Vulgar Latin renders, *Paſce*, *feed* my Sheep and Lambs: Now their Commentators on this place, (to very little purpoſe) make a great ſtir and pudder to ſhew (what (*k*) none denys) that ποιμαίνω ſignifies to *rule* and *govern*. But let the word ſignifie what it will, in the Civil State, yet in the Eccleſiaſtical and Scripture Senſe of the Word, where our bleſſed Saviours Lambs and Sheep (that is the Faithful) are to be fed, every Biſhop and Presbyter (as well as *Peter*) are ποιμένες, *Paſtores*, and may and ought ποιμαίνειν, to feed the Flock of Chriſt. So, 1. St.

(*k*) 'Tis certain, and confeſs'd, that ποιμαίνω ſignifies to rule. Kings are call'd ποιμένες λαῶν, populi paſtores. So *Menelaus* and *Agamemnon* uſually in *Homer*, and in *Heſychius* ποιμὴν Βασιλεύς. And ποιμένα λαῶν, καὶ ὁ τῶν προβάτων. And the Gloſſ. veteres in Calce Cyrilli, ποιμαίνω, *pecora paſco*; and ποιμαίνω ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων, *Rego.*

Paul tells us, (*l*) who from *Miletum*, ſends for the *Presbyters of Epheſus*, (I ſay Presbyters, for *Timothy*, who was their firſt Biſhop, was with *Paul* at (*m*) *Miletum*, and ſo was none of thoſe he ſent for) and when they came, he Exhorts *them to take heed unto themſelves, and the Flock*, (n) *To feed the Church of God*, &c. where St. *Paul* (when he bids the *Presbyters feed the Church*) uſeth the very ſame word our bleſſed Saviour doth, when he bids *Peter feed his Sheep*. 2. So (*o*) *Peter* himſelf (who little dream'd of any Supremacy given him by thoſe words, *Feed my Sheep*) writing to the *Aſiatick* Diſperſion of the *Jews*, and Exhorting the Jewiſh Elders, (or Preſbyters) to a diligent care, *in feeding the Flock*; he uſeth the very ſame word to them, our bleſſed Saviour did to him, ποιμάνατε (ſays he) *Feed the Flock*; He thinks it their duty, as well as his, to feed our bleſſed Saviour's Sheep. And that which further, and (*ad hominem*) more ſtrongly confirms what I have ſaid (in this Particular) is; That our Adverſaries grant (though in Contradiction to the Senſe many of them give of thoſe words, *Feed my Sheep*, when they would build the Popes Supremacy upon them) that the word ποιμαίνω, both as it ſignifies to *rule* and *feed*, and ſo the *duty* of *ruling* and *feeding* our bleſſed Saviours Sheep, is ſo far from being Peculiar to *Peter*, or proving his Supremacy, that it is the Duty, not only of *Peter*, but of every Biſhop in the Chriſtian World, both to *rule* and *feed* our bleſſed Saviour's *Sheep*. This the

(*l*) Act. 20. 17. Τὺς πρεσβυτέρυς τῆ ἐκκλησίας. *The Presbyters of that Church.*

(*m*) Act. 20. 4. 6.

(*n*) Verſ. 28. cap. 20. ποιμαίνειν τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, &c.

(*o*) 1. Pet. 5. 2. ποιμάνατε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον.

the (*p*) *Trent Catechiſm* expreſly affirms, *That all Biſhops* (as well as *Peter*) *are* Paſtores, *Paſtors to Rule as well as Feed the Flock and Sheep of our bleſſed Saviour*; and to prove this, they Cite the Two very (*q*) places which I (a little before) produced to the ſame purpoſe, whence it manifeſtly appears, That even in our Adverſaries Judgment, (when the Popes Supremacy is a little out of their Head) *the feeding our bleſſed Saviour's ſheep, is not* Peter's *Supream Prerogative, but a Duty required of every Biſhop in the World.*

(p) *Epiſcopi* (ſays that Catechiſm) *ſingulis Epiſcopatibus præpoſiti ſunt, ut Cæteros Eccleſiæ Miniſtros, & fidelium populum Regant, & eorum ſaluti ſummâ Curâ Proſpiciant; unde in Sacris Literis Paſtores Ovium) ſæpe Appellantur.* Catechiſ. Trid. part. 2. cap. 7. §. 26. pag. 389. 390. Editionis Pariſ. 1635.

(*q*) Act. 20. 28. 1. Pet. 5. 2. 3.

3. But this (though enough) is not all; we have greater (and with them Infallible, and therefore undeniable) Authority to confirm what I have ſaid, and Confute our Adverſaries, as to their proof of *Peter's*, or the Pope's Supremacy, from thoſe words, *Feed my Sheep.* For their *Trent Council* (which if the Pope ſay true, was (*r*) *Divinely Inſpired*, and therefore Infallible; and if he do not ſay true, he himſelf was not only fallible but actually falſe) expreſly tells us, *That not only every Biſhop, but every one* (ſ) *who had Cure of Souls, was bound by the Law of Chriſt in the Goſpel, to rule and feed his Sheep, by offering Sacrifices for them, by preaching the Word, Adminiſtring the Sacraments, by good Example, by a Paternal Care of the Poor, and All Other Paſtoral Offices.* And this is there proved by Texts, quoted in the Margent; which (with ſome others) are the very ſame with thoſe I have (a little before) cited out of the

(r) *Dominus Patres Tridentinos Divinitùs Inſpirare dignatus eſt.* Pius Papa. 4. in Bullâ ſuper formâ Juramenti profeſſionis Fidei.

(ſ) *Præcepto Divino Mandatum eſt Omnibus, quibus Animarum Cura Commiſſa eſt, Oves Agnoſcere, pro iis Sacrificium offerre, verbi prædicatione, Sacramentorum Adminiſtratione, ac bonorum operum Exemplo paſcere, pauperum curam paternam gerere, & in Cætera Munia Paſtoralia incumbere* ——*ideo Synodus eos admonet, ut præceptorum divinorum memores, in Judicio & veritate Paſcant & Regant.* Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 21. De Reformat. cap. 1. Edit. Antverp. 1633. pag. 284.

(t) Act. 20. 28.
(u) 1. Pet. 5. 2.

(x) Joh. 21. 15. 16.

the (t) Acts of the Apoſtles, and (u) St. *Peters* Epiſtle: Nor thoſe only, but this very place of (x) St. *John* (on which they would build *Peter's* Supremacy) is Cited in the Margent, as containing a *Precept* obliging (not *Peter* only, but) *All, who had Cure of ſouls, to feed Chriſt's ſheep.* Now if thoſe words, *Feed my ſheep*, contain *Præceptum*, a Precept, Obliging all Paſtors to a Paſtoral Duty; then they do not contain (what they pretend) *Donum*, a Donation of Supremacy.

(y) That of *Bonif.* 8. Cap. Unam Sanctam. 1. De Major. & Obed. Extravag. Commun. and that of *Innocent.* 3. cap. Solicitæ. 6. extra eodem Titulo.

4. But Pope *Boniface.* VIII. and Pope *Innocent.* III. in their before mention'd (y) Conſtitutions, tell us; that by *Oves meas*, our bleſſed Saviour means, *All his ſheep*, All Chriſtians in the World; Becauſe he does not ſpeak *ſingulariter* of *theſe* or *thoſe*; but *Generaliter* of his *ſheep.* Whence they, (and many after them) conclude, That our bleſſed Saviour Committed all his Sheep Univerſally to *Peter's* Care, ſo that even the Apoſtles, (being his Sheep) were committed to *Peter's* Care, and by Conſequence, he became their Paſtor and Superior. Certainly they who reaſon at this rate, and ſo irrationally, may poſſibly be fit Paſtors to feed Sheep and Oxen, and ſuch other brutiſh Cattle, but ſurely not to feed Men and Chriſtians. For, 1. *Feed my ſheep*, (as all know, unleſs they be ſuch as thoſe two Popes were) is *an Indefinite Propoſition:* and then any Novice or young Sophiſter in the Univerſity, could have truly told them, That *Propoſitio indefinita in materia Contingenti*,

Contingenti, (as this evidently is) *æquivalet particulari.* When we ſay men are young or wiſe, or learned; we mean, not all, but ſome are ſuch. So he who ſays, *Chriſt's ſheep are to be fed by Peter*; muſt mean ſome of them are to be fed by him, *pro loco & tempore*, as he had place and time to meet with them. It being impoſſible he ſhould feed them (z) all. There were many thouſands of our bleſſed Saviour's Sheep, whom *Peter* never did, nor could ſee, nor they hear him: And certainly his gracious Lord and Maſter would not tye him to Impoſſibilities. 2. When they ſay, (which is evidently untrue) that by thoſe words — *Feed my ſheep*, all the Faithful are meant, and are Committed to *Peter*'s care and charge; and therefore the (a) Apoſtles themſelves (being our Saviour's Sheep as well as others) are part of his Charge; and under his Juriſdiction. This they ſay indeed uſually, but (miſerably miſtaken) only ſay it. For they neither have, nor can have any Juſt Ground or Reaſon for it. For it is certain, 1. That our bleſſed Saviour, is (to his whole Church) the only (b) *High Prieſt*, *the* (c) *Prince of all the Paſtors, and the Grand* (d) *Shepherd of the ſheep*; and as King, has Imperial Power to Rule and Govern them. 2. It is certain, the Apoſtles (from and under him) are *Paſtores* and Shepherds, as well as *Peter*, to feed the Flock. But their Power is *Miniſterial*, not *Imperial.*

(z) *Maldonat.* ſpeaking of Matth. 28. 19. where our bleſſed Saviour gives Commiſſion to all his Apoſtles——— *Go ye therefore into All the World, &c.* He ſays thus——— *Non fieri poterat ut Singuli omnes terræ partes peragrarent, Gentéſque Omnes docerent; néque erat neceſſarium. Quid enim erat Opus, ut Omnes à ſingulis, modo Omnes ab hominibus, aliæ ab aliis docerentur.* Maldonat. in Joh. 21. 15. 16. &c. §. 65. p. 1889. E. This he ſays, and truly. But then he ſhould have conſider'd, that if it was impoſſible for every one of the Apoſtles to teach all the world; then it will be impoſſible for any one. Impoſſible for *Peter* to feed all Chriſt's Sheep in the whole world: and yet this he endeavours to prove——— *Quicunque intra Eccleſiam erant, Petro paſcendos tradit. Dicit enim paſce Oves, non has, aut illas, ſed paſce Oves meas. Omnium ergo ſuarum Ovium curam illi dedit.* Ibid. §. 62.

(a) *Ex hoc loco* (Joh. 21. 15.) *patet Sanctum Petrum* (*& Ejus Succeſſores Romanos Pontifices*) *eſſe Caput & Principem Eccleſiæ, Omnéſque fideles, etiam Apoſtolos Ipſi Subjici, & ab eo Paſci & Regi debere.* Corn. A Lapide, in Joh. 21. 15. p. 547. Col. 2.

(b) Heb. 4. 14. Τὸν ἀρχιερέα τὸν μέγαν διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς. (c) 1. Pet. 5. 4. Ἀρχιποίμην. (d) Heb. 13. 20. τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων τὸν μέγαν.

perial. Even the Apostleship it self is (*e*) Διακονία, a Ministery, and they Ministers of *Christ*, and his (*f*) *Church.* Now though in respect of Christ the great Shepherd, they are Sheep, even *Peter* himself: yet (on Earth) they are Shepherds only, not Sheep, neither in respect of the Church, over which our blessed Saviour has set them to be Shepherds; nor in relation one to another. *Paul*, or *James*, or *John*, are no more Sheep in Respect of *Peter*, to be *fed* and *ruled* by him, then he to be *fed* and *ruled* by them: And therefore to say (as our Adversaries vainly do) that in those words, *Feed my sheep*; *Peter* is Commanded to feed and rule the rest of the Apostles, as his Charge, (who were Shepherds only, and Sheep to no Superior Pastor, except our blessed Saviour; And by their Apostolical Commission (*g*) Equal to himself) is irrational; without any ground in Scripture, or purer Antiquity. There is another Metaphor concerning the Apostles, and their Feeding and Building the Church, which may illustrate this business, All the Apostles (as well and as much as *Peter*) are in Scripture call'd *Foundations of the Church*, converted, fed, and confirm'd by them. In respect of Christ, our blessed Saviour (who is the only prime and principal firm Rock on which the Church is built) they are (*all of them*) *Superstructions*; but in respect of the Christian Church, Foundations; and that without any dependence upon *Peter*; he is not the Foundation on which they are built, but both

(*e*) Act. 1. 17. 25.

(*f*) 2. Cor. 4. 5.

(*g*) *Hoc erant Cæteri Apostoli, quod fuit Petrus; Pari Consortio præditi & Honoris, & Potestatis.* Cyprian. de Unit. Eccles. p. 208. Edit. Rigaltij. *Pastores sunt Omnes Apostoli, sed Grex Unus, qui ab Omnibus unanimi Consensione Pascatur. Pasce Oves meas,* belong'd equally to all the Apostles, as well as to *Peter*, in *Cyprian*'s Opinion, as shall appear anon.

but both he and they immediately upon the Prime Rock and Foundation, *Jeſus Chriſt:* So that as the Apoſtles are *Superſtructures* in the Houſe of God (the Church) in Reſpect of Chriſt, the Prime firm Foundation; and none of them *Superſtructures*, in reſpect of *Peter:* being neither built upon him, nor made Superſtructions by him, by his Feeding or Ruling them: So they (and *Peter* too) are *Sheep* in Reſpect of our bleſſed Saviour, the great Shepherd of the Sheep; but not in reſpect of *Peter*; they are Shepherds as well as he, and never Committed to his Care or Cure, that (as his Sheep) he ſhould feed and govern them: And as all the other Apoſtles (in Reſpect of *Peter*) were Foundations & Shepherds of the Church, coordinate with, and equal to him: So all other Biſhops, the Apoſtles Succeſſors, were Equal to *Peter's* pretended Succeſſor (the Biſhop of *Rome*) and no way bound to give any Reaſon of their Adminiſtration to him, as to their Superior; much leſs as to a Supream Prince and Monarch of the Chriſtian World, as the Caniniſts, Jeſuits, and the Popiſh Party, do now Erroneouſly and Impiouſly miſcall him. This was *Cyprian's* Opinion, in the Place but now Cited; And *Rigaltius* (a Learned *Roman Catholick*) though he (*h*) ſeem to ſay much for *Peter's* and the Popes Supremacy; yet he Confeſſeth, (as upon a ſerious Conſideration of ſeveral Paſſages in (*i*) *Cyprian*, and the *African Councils*, well he might) That *Cyprian's* (*k*) *Opinion*

(*h*) Nicol. Regaltius in Obſervatione Galeata, Notis ſuis ad Cypriani Opera præfixa.

(*i*) Vid. Cypr. Epiſt. 67. p. 128. 129. Edit. Rigaltii: & Epiſt. 72. Ibid. p. 142. in Calce dictæ Epiſtolæ, &c. & Epiſt. 55. p. 95.

(k) *Singulis Paſtoribus Epiſcopis portionem gregis eſſe adſcriptam, quam regat unuſquiſque; Actus ſui, ſive Adminiſtrationis ſuæ rationem redditurus; Non Romæ, ſed in Cœlis; Non Cornelio, ſed Chriſto* ——*Negat* (Cyprianus) *Eccleſiæ Romanæ Ullas eſſe Partes in Cauſa Novatiani, peractâ jam in Africâ Cognitione damnati.* (There lay no Appeal to the Pope, as Superior to the Biſhops of *Africa*). Rigaltius in Notis ad Cypriani Epiſtolam 55. p. 95. & Notarum p. 77. 78.

nion was, That all Biſhops were equal, and were bound to give an Account of their Adminiſtration to our bleſſed Saviour Only, and not to any Superior Biſhop, no not to Peter's *Succeſſor, the Pope.* Nor is it any way probable, that a Perſon ſo Excellent and Knowing as *Cyprian*, ſhould think otherwiſe; ſeeing in his time (as is notorious and well known to all who know Antiquity) there was no Patriarch or Archbiſhop Superior (by any Law of God or Man) to the Ordinary Biſhops, (as may, and when there is an Opportunity, ſhall be made Good.) It is true, *Cyprian* (if it be he, and not the Interpolator of that Tract) ſays, *That the Primacy* (l) *was given to* Peter; *and that the Church of* Rome *was The* (m) *Principal Church.* Now this *Primacy*, and *Principality Cyprian* ſpeaks of, is, by me before, and now freely granted. *A Primacy of Order and Precedency*, not of *Juriſdiction*, or that *Monarchical Authority*, which (Anciently was not pretended to by themſelves) they now contend for. And this Primacy, which anciently was allowed to the Biſhop of *Rome*, was not from *our bleſſed Saviour's gift*, but the greatneſs of *that Imperial City*; *Non à* (n) *Petro, ſed à Patribus*, (as the Canon of *Chalcedon* tells us.) And that which makes it more probable, that I have given the true Senſe of *Cyprian*, is; That *Rigaltius* (a Learned *Roman Catholick*) in his Diſſertations, and Notes on *Cyprian*, Explains *Cyprian*'s meaning juſt as I have done, reducing the *Primacy* and *Principality* of the *Roman Church*, not

(l) Cyprian De Unitate Eccleſiæ, pag. 208. apud Rigaltium. *Hoc erant Cæteri Apoſtoli, quod fuit Petrus, Pari Conſortio præditi honoris & Poteſtatis; ſed Primatus Petro datur.*

(m) Cyprian. Epiſt. 55. ad Cornelium, pag. 95. *Ad Petri Cathedram, & ad Eccleſiam Principalem, unde unitas exorta eſt.*

(n) Διὰ τὸ Βασιλεύουσαν τὴν πόλιν, &c. *Quia Urbs illa Imperaret, Patres dederunt Privilegia.* Conc. Chalcedonenſe. Can. 28.

not from any Prerogative given to that Biſhop or Church by our bleſſed Saviour, *but from the greatneſs of that* (o) *Imperial City:* And then Cites the Canon of the General Council of *Chalcedon*, which *in Terminis*, and (when Tranſlated) in plain *Engliſh*, ſays the very ſame thing I have done. And indeed that Canon, made by Six hundred and thirty Fathers Synodically met, in a legitimate General Council, confirm'd by (p) *Imperial Edicts*, and received into the *Codex Canonum Eccleſiæ Univerſæ*, does Authentickly and utterly overthrow that vaſt Monarchical Supremacy, which the Pope and his Party for ſome Ages laſt paſt (without any juſt ground) contend for. If any of our Adverſaries think otherwiſe, (as poſſibly they may) I ſhall make them this fair offer; Let them bring me any Canon, of any General Council (of equal Authority and Antiquity with this of *Chalcedon*) by which they can prove the Popes pretended Supremacy, (or any one Article of their own new *Trent Creed*). And for the future, I ſhall acquieſce, and they ſhall have my Thanks and Subſcription.

(o) *Ad Eccleſiam Principalem*] *Id eſt, in Urbe Principali Conſtitutam.* Rigaltius ad Epiſt. Cyprian. 55. p. 78. Notarum

(p) Juſtiniani Conſtit. Novel. 115. Cap. 3. §. 14. Græco-Lat. Lugd. 1571. p. 745. & Novel. Conſt. 131. cap. 1. ibid. p. 1056. where the Emperor ſays ——τῶν προειρημένων &c. *dictarum quatuor Synodorum dogmata, ſicut Sanctas Scripturas accipimus, & Canones ſicut Leges Obſervamus.*

6. *Pius.* V. in his Bull ſays further — (q) *That our bleſſed Saviour Committed the Care and Charge of the Univerſal Church, with a plenitude of Power to govern it, to one only, that is to* Peter *the Prince of the Apoſtles, And His Succeſſors.* Here I conſider,

(q) *Chriſtus Catholicam Eccleſiam unum ſoli in terris, Apoſtolorum Principi Petro, Petrique Succeſſori Rom. Pontifici, in Poteſtatis plenitudine tradidit gubernandam.* Ita Bulla dicta in principio. *Obſerv.* 6.

1. That although it be certain, (from Scripture, and evident Teſtimonies of pure and primitive

Antiquity) that *Peter* never had, nor Executed any ſuch Monarchical Supremacy over the other Apoſtles, and the whole Chriſtian Church, as is now vainly pretended to; yet 'tis as certain, that the Pope (and his Party) cry up, and magnifie St. *Peter's* Power, that he (as his Heir and Succeſſor) may poſſeſs the ſame Power. For this they ſay, (and without any juſt proof, ſay it only) *That it was our bleſſed Saviour's will, that* Peter's *Succeſſor ſhould have* (r) *The Very ſame Power* Peter *had*; and this becauſe he *was* (ſ) *Chriſt's Vicar*, (though every Biſhop in the World, (as ſhall, God willing, appear anon) be Chriſt's Vicar as well, and as much as he) *and ſat in* Peter's *Chair, as his lawful Succeſſor.*

2. But admit, (*dato non Conceſſo*) which is abſolutely untrue, That *Peter* had ſuch a Supremacy and Monarchical Power (as they Erroneouſly pretend to) yet it might be *Perſonal*, to himſelf, and for his Life only, (as his Apoſtolical power was; as to that part of it, which was properly Apoſtolical) and not Hereditary, to be transferred to any Succeſſor. So that the Hinge of the Controverſie will be here, and our Adverſaries concern'd to prove two Things. 1. That *Peter's* Power (be what it will) was not Perſonal, but Hereditary, and to be Tranſmitted to his Succeſſor. 2. And that the Pope and Biſhop of *Rome* was his Legal Succeſſor. For if they do not, upon juſt Grounds, make both theſe good, good night to their pretended Supremacy.

For

(r) *Chriſtus Petrum univerſi fidelium generis Caput & Paſtorem Conſtituit, cum illi Oves ſuas paſcendas commendavit, ut qui ei Succeſſiſſet, Eandem Plane totius Eccleſiæ regendæ Poteſtatem habere voluerit.* Catechiſ. Trid. Part. 1. De. 9. Symboli Art. §. 13. p. 117. Pariſ. 1635.

(ſ) *Cum in Petri Cathedrâ ſedeat, ut Petri Succeſſor, Chriſtique Vicarius in terris, Univerſali Eccleſiæ Præſidet.* Ibid. Part. 2. cap. 7. §. 28. p. 391.

For the Firſt; That the greateſt Power St. *Peter* and the Apoſtles had, was Extraordinary and Perſonal, not to be Tranſmitted to any Succeſſor (what Power they did tranſmit, I ſhall anon ſhew) will be Evident, in theſe Particulars.

1. *Peter* and the Apoſtles, had *Vocationem à Chriſto Immediatam.* Our bleſſed (*t*) Saviour call'd them all (except *Matthias*) Immediately; as is evident from the Text. And, ſure I am, that the Pope cannot pretend to ſuch an Immediate Call.

I.

(*t*) Matth. 10. 1. Mark. 3. 14. Luk. 9. 1.

2. The Apoſtles (every one as well as *Peter*) had a Power given them to do Miracles, *to Caſt out* (u) *Devils, and heal all manner of Diſeaſes, and Sickneſſes.* Nor can *Peter's* Succeſſor (whoever he be) pretend to this.

(*u*) Ibid. Matth. 10. 1.

3. The Juriſdiction, which was by our bleſſed Saviour given to every Apoſtle, (to *James* and *John*, and *Paul* as well as *Peter*) was Univerſal; the whole World was their Dioceſe. Not that every one could poſſibly be in every place, but where ever any of them came, they had Authority to Preach, Adminiſter the Sacraments, Conſtitute and Govern Churches. So *Paul* did at (*x*) *Antioch* and *Rome*, as much, and (*y*) *more than Peter*; though they pretend that *Peter* alone (and not *Paul*) was firſt Biſhop of both thoſe Places. That every Apoſtle (as well as *Peter*) had Univerſal Juriſdiction and Authority over the whole World, is in Scripture Evident by the Commiſſion our bleſſed Saviour gave them—(*z*) *Go and teach all Nations,*

(*x*) It does not appear in Scripture, that *Peter* ever was at *Antioch*, ſave once. Gal. 2. 11. But *Paul* was many times, and long there, and conſtituted that Church. See Act. 11. 26. Act. 14. 21. 28. Act. 15. 35. Act. 18. 22. 23.

(*y*) *Paul* was there two whole years, Act. 28. 30. writ them a long and excellent Epiſtle; But 'tis certain, *Peter* never writ to them, nor can it appear from Scripture that he was ever two weeks, much leſs two years, at *Rome.* Where St. *Paul* is, by *Origen*, ſaid to be (next Chriſt) *Primus Eccleſiarum Fundator.* Origen Contra Celſum, lib. 1. pag. 49. Græco-Lat.

(*z*) Matth. 28. 19. 20.

tions, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt: Teaching them to obſerve whatſoever I have Commanded you. And again, —(*a*) *Go ye into all the World, and Preach the Goſpel to every Creature.* Here I obſerve, 1. That the Apoſtles in their firſt Miſſion, were ſent to the (*b*) *Jews*, and *them only.* But now their Commiſſion is Inlarged; and they are Equally ſent (every one as much as any one) *to all Nations* (ſays *Matthew*) *To All the World*, (κόσμον ἅπαντα, πᾶσαν οἰκουμένην, as (*c*) *Euſebius* Explains it) ſays St. *Mark*; *Iidem Juriſdictionis Apoſtolicæ & Orbis Termini*; The whole World was their Dioceſe; every ones Juriſdiction Extended ſo far, and *Peter's* could not extend no further. 2. For the Perſons they were to Preach to, they were *Every Man in the World.* It is πάσῃ κτίσει, *to every Creature*, (every Rational Creature, who (if Infancy and Infirmity hinder'd not) was capable. They were to *Convert Pagans*, and make them our bleſſed Saviour's *Diſciples* and *Sheep*, and then *feed them*, with the Word and Sacraments: Μαθητεύσατε, (ſays *Matthew*) *Convert*, and make them *Diſciples*, and then *Baptize* and *Teach them to obſerve whatever I have Commanded you.* Thoſe words, *Feed my ſheep* (on which without any juſt Reaſon, they would build *Peter's* Supremacy) contain only an *Indefinite Propoſition*, which (as every one who underſtands Logick, muſt Confeſs) is only *equivalent to a Particular*; But here the Commiſſion, given by our bleſſed Saviour, (to every Apoſtle as well as *Peter*) is

(*a*) Mark. 16. 15.

(*b*) Matth. 10. 5. 6.

(*c*) Euſeb. l. 3. Demonſtrat. Evangelicæ. p. 136. and he has our bleſſed Saviour's word for it. Matth. 24. 14. ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ.

is *expreſly Univerſal*; *Preach to every Creature*: That is, *Feed All my ſheep*. This is a Truth ſo evident, that a Learned (*d*) *Roman Catholick Confeſſeth* and fully proves it. Only (to ſave the Popes and his own Credit) he ſays, *That to call General Councils belong'd only to* Peter *and the Pope, by their Supremacy, and not to any other.* But this is, *gratis dictum*, and an evident Untruth. For the Pope (by no Law of God or Man) has, or ever had Power, to call any General Council: And for many Ages never pretended to it; which I only ſay now, and (when there is a Convenient time) can and will make it (*e*) Good. In the mean time, I think 'tis certain, either, 1. That by thoſe words, *Feed my ſheep*, (on which they build the Popes and *Peters* Supremacy) our bleſſed Saviour gave *Peter* no ſupream Power to call General Councils, that by them he might feed his Sheep: Or, 2. That the Apoſtles and Primitive Chriſtians in their times, knew no ſuch thing. For, 1. When a *Controverſie* aroſe at *Antioch*, about Circumciſion, they ſend not to *Peter*, as ſupream Head of the Church, deſiring him to call a Council; but *to the* (f) *Apoſtles and Elders*. Had they known and believ'd, that *Peter* had been Inveſted with ſuch Power and Supremacy, as is now pretended; it had been Civility and Duty in them, to have ſent to him

(*d*) Franc. Victoria. Relect. Theol. Lugduni. 1587. Relect. 2. De Poteſtate Eccleſiæ Concl. 4. p. 85. where he tells us, *Apoſtoli Omnes habuerunt Æqualem Poteſtatem cum Petro. Quod ſic Intelligo; quod Quilibet Apoſtolorum habuit Poteſtatem Eccleſiaſticam in Toto Orbe, & ad Omnes Actus ad quos Petrus habuit. Non tamen loquor de illis Actibus, qui ſpectant ad ſolum ſummum Pontificem, ut eſt Congregatio Generalis Concilij.* And this he there proves; as to their Power over the whole world, and to Acts; only (and he dared do no otherwiſe) he excepts ſome few, to which no Pope, for many Ages, pretended. In the preſent *Roman Breviary* the Univerſal Juriſdiction of *Paul* (as well as *Peter*) is acknowledg'd; *Paul* an Apoſtle, *Prædicator veritatis per Univerſum Mundum.* In Feſto Cathedræ Petri Antiochiæ. Febr. 22.

(*e*) A Learned Papiſt, Doctor of the *Sorbon* (newly come to my hand) has ſaved me the labour, and *ex profeſſo*, and *data opera* proved, that all the Eight firſt General Councils were call'd ſolely by the Emperors: The Popes did indeed (as he evidently proves) ſometimes *Petition* the Emperors, to call a Council at ſuch a time or place; but they were always both call'd and confirm'd by the Emperors. Vid. Edm. Richer. D. Sorb. in Hiſt. de Conc. General. Colon. 1680.

(*f*) Act. 15. 2.

in

in the firſt place; But they ſend to the *Apoſtles and Elders*; without any notice taken of (what they knew not) *Peter*'s Prerogative. 2. It neither does, nor can appear, that *Peter* call'd that Council. 3. Nor did he (as Head and Preſident of the Council) ſpeak (*g*) firſt; but the Queſtion was much diſputed, before *Peter* ſpoke any thing. 4. Nor did *Peter* (after the Queſtion was debated) give the Definitive Sentence; For 'tis Evident (*h*) in the Text, That *James* the Leſs, Son of *Alphæus*, and Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, gave that *Definitive Sentence*, which both *Peter* and the whole (*i*) Council acquieſc'd in. 5. Nor did *Peter* ſend his Legats to *Antioch*, to ſignifie what he, and the Council had done, but the (*k*) Apoſtles and the whole Church choſe and ſent their Meſſengers. 6. Nor are the Letters ſent in *Peter*'s Name, or any notice taken of any Primacy or Prerogative of his, above the other Apoſtles; No, the Ἐπιγραφὴ is, (*l*) *The Apoſtles, Elders, and Brethren ſend Greeting.* 7. Nor was that *Decree* publiſh'd To the Churches in *Peter*'s Name, as made or (*m*) confirm'd by him, more than any other Apoſtle. 8. Nay, the Apoſtles ſend *Peter* on a (*n*) Meſſage to *Samaria* (and he obeys and goes) which had been a ſtrange piece of Preſumption, had either he or they known his (now pretended) Monarchical Supremacy. 9. So far were thoſe *Primitive Chriſtians*, from knowing or acknowledging the now pretended Monarchical Supremacy of *Peter*, that even in the

(*g*) Act. 15.7.

(*h*) Act. 15.19.20.21.

(*i*) Act. 15.22.

(*k*) Ibidem.

(*l*) Act. 15.23. Vide dictum Edmundum Richerium D.Sorbonicum, in Hiſt. Conc. Generalium, lib. 1. cap. 13. §. 5. pag. 401. Edit. Colon. 1680. Ubi ex Card. Alliaceno, & Concilio hoc Apoſtolico Act. 15. demonſtrat, Petrum Primatum (qualem Jeſuitæ vellent) non habuiſſe, ſed Primatum illum Monarchicum ab Hildebrando, ſeu Gregorio. 7. retroductum. Ibid. §. 2. 5.

(*m*) Act. 16.4.

(*n*) Act. 8.14.

the Apoſtles times and Preſence, they *queſtion* and (*a*) call him to *an Account for his Actions.* Διεκρίνοντο, *diſceptabant adverſus illum* (ſays the Vulgar Latin) *tanquam valde offenſi expoſtulabant* (ſays *Chryſoſtom.*) And honeſt *John Ferus* (a *Roman Catholick*) tells us, (*b*) *That he was Compell'd to give a Reaſon of his Actions to the Church; nor was* Peter *offended at it, becauſe he knew that he was not a Lord, but Miniſter of the Church.* But now (as (*c*) *Ferus* there goes on) the Caſe is alter'd; *for wicked Popes, (as though they were Lords and not Miniſters) will not be Queſtion'd for any thing, or reprov'd.* Had the Canon Law been then in force, (which his pretended Succeſſors have approved, and by their Supream Authority publiſh'd) he might have told thoſe who Queſtion'd him, (*d*) *That he was to judge all men, and none him; nor was he to be reprov'd by any mortal man, though by his Impiety and ill Example, he carried thouſands to Hell with him.* 10. Nay, St. *Paul* does not only (*e*) *queſtion St.* Peter's *Actions, but to his face, before the People publickly condemn them, and that juſtly; for* (he ſays) *he was to be blamed:* which he neither would, nor indeed well could have done, had he known *Peter* to have been ſo far his Superior as to have (by Divine Inſtitution) a Monarchical Juriſdiction and Power over him. 11. Laſtly, St. *Paul* himſelf tells us, (*f*) *That he was in Nothing Inferior to the Chiefeſt Apoſtles*; not to *Peter, James*, or *John*, whom (*g*) elſewhere he reckons the chiefeſt. I know they ſay,

(*a*) Act. 11.2.3.

(*b*) *Petrus Apoſtolorum Primus, rationem reddere Eccleſiæ Cogitur, nec indigne fert, quia non Dominum ſed Miniſtrum Eccleſiæ ſe agere ſciebat.* Ferus in Act. 11.2.

(*c*) *Impij autem Pontifices Nunc nec ab Eccleſiâ argui, aut in Ordinem cogi volunt, quaſi ſint Domini non Miniſtri.* Ibidem.

(d) *Si Papa innumerabiles populos ſecum ducit, primo mancipio Gehennæ, &c. Hujus Culpas redarguere præſumat mortalium nullus: quia Cunctos ipſe judicaturus, à nemine eſt Judicandus; niſi ſit à fide devius.* Can. ſi Papa. 6. Diſt. 40.

(*e*) Gal.2. 11. 12. 13. 14.

(*f*) 2. Cor. 11. 5. & 12. verſ. 11.

(*g*) Gal.2.9.

That Paul *was equal to* Peter *as to his Apoſtolical Office, but Inferior to* Peter, *as he was* (h) *Supream Paſtor over the Apoſtles, and the whole Church.* But this is *gratis dictum*, and indeed a begging of the Queſtion, and taking that for granted, which never was, nor ever will be proved. However, 'tis certain, 1. That every Apoſtle (as well as *Peter*) had an *Univerſal ſupream* (i) *Authority and Juriſdiction*, in any Part of the World, and over any Chriſtians wherever they came. 2. That this largeneſs of their Juriſdiction, was Apoſtolical, and Perſonal to themſelves, which they neither did, nor could tranſmit to their Succeſſors; whoſe Juriſdiction was limited to ſome City and Territory, and that particular Place, the Care and Charge whereof was committed unto them; as *Epheſus* was to *Timothy*, and *Creet* to *Titus*. 3. Our Adverſaries confeſs this, (as to all the other Apoſtles) but for *Peter*, they ſay, *He* (k) *tranſmitted his Supremacy and Univerſal Juriſdiction over the whole Church to his Succeſſor, and that by the Inſtitution of our bleſſed Saviour, and Divine Right.* If they could prove this, the Controverſie were at an end; we would acquieſce, and admit (what upon undeniable evidence we deny) the Popes Supremacy. But this they neither do, nor is there any poſſibility they ever ſhould prove. For there is not one Syllable in (l) Scripture, of *Peter's* Succeſſor, or of what Power he received from him: and nothing but Scripture can prove our bleſſed *Saviour's Inſtitution*, and *Divine Law*, where-

(h) *Locus hic non derogat prærogativæ Petri, qui totius Eccleſiæ rector & Paſtor Conſtitutus, etiam ipſis Apoſtolis Major & Superior fuit.* Eſtius in 2. Cor. 12. 11.

(i) *Qui Apoſtolus eſt, Summam habet in Omnem Eccleſiam Poteſtatem.* Bellarmin. De Rom. Pontif. lib. 2. cap. 12. in Reſponſ. 3. & Object. 2.

(k) *Succeſſio ex Chriſti Inſtituto, & Jure Divino eſt, quia ipſe Chriſtus Inſtituit in Petro Pontificatum, in finem Mundi duraturum, ac ideo quicunque Petro ſuccedit, à Chriſto accipit Pontificatum.* Bellarmin. dicto lib. & cap. §. ut autem.

(l) *Romanum Pontificem ſuccedere Petro, non habetur expreſſè in Scripturis,* (no, nor *Implicitè* neither) *tamen ſuccedere aliquem Petro, deducitur evidenter ex Scripturis, illum autem eſſe Romanum Pontificem, habetur ex traditione Apoſtolica.* Bellarmin. dicto lib. & cap. §. Obſervandum Tertio.

whereby *Peter*'s Supremacy is tranſmitted to his Succeſſor. The truth is, that *Pius*. V. in the beginning of this his Impious Bull, and other Popes *many* (m) *times* in their Bulls, Breves, and Decretal Conſtitutions, and their Writers generally, take it for granted, that our bleſſed Saviour gave *Peter* the Supremacy over the whole Church, and to *his Succeſſors after him:* And when (*n*) ſome of them, ſometimes go about to prove it, the Reaſons they bring, are ſo far from Senſe and Conſequence, that they may deſerve Pity and Contempt, rather than a ſerious Anſwer. But when Reaſon will not Convince, they have other Roman Arts to Coſen men into a Belief, that what was given to *Peter*, was likewiſe given to the Pope his Succeſſor; and that is (amongſt other ways) by Corrupting the Ancient Fathers with falſe Tranſlations. So when *Chryſoſtom* had ſaid, *That the Power of the Keys, was not given to* Peter *only, but to the reſt of the Apoſtles: Pet. Poſſinus* adds, *Succeſſors*; and renders it thus— *The Power of the Keys was not given only to* Peter *And His* (o) *Succeſſors, &c.* where *Chryſoſtome* (whom he Tranſlates) has nothing of *Peter's Succeſſors:* but truly and plainly ſays—*That the Power of the Keys was not given only to* Peter, *but to the reſt of the Apoſtles, when our bleſſed* (*p*) *Savionr told them, whoſe ſins ye remit they are remitted, and whoſe ſins ye retain, they are retained.* So in the Epiſtle of Pope (*q*) *Leo* to the Biſhops of *France*, and of his Legat *Paſchaſinus* about the Condemnation of *Dioſcorus*,

(*m*) Vid. Cap. Solitæ. 6. Extra. de Major. & Obedientiâ. & Cap. Per venerabilem. 13. Extra. Qui filij ſunt legit. & Cap. Ad Apoſtolicæ. 2. De Sent. & re judicatâ, in. 6. & Cap. pro Human. 1. De Homicidio, in. 6.

(*n*) Vid. Tho. Campegium Epiſc. Feltrenſem, de Poteſtate Rom. Pont. Capp. 13. 14. & Bellarminum de Roman. Pontifice, lib. 2. c. 12. &c.

(o) Οὐ μόνῳ γὰρ τῷ Πέτρῳ τῶν ἁπάντων, &c *Non id Petro uni Succeſſoribuſque ſuis reſervatum.* Pet. Poſſinus Jeſuita, Catena Græc. Patrum in Matth. Tom. 1. p. 232.

(*p*) Joh. 20. 22, 23.

(*q*) Vid. Pet. de Marca de Concordia Sacerdotij & Imperij. Tom. 2. l. 5. c. 10. §. 2. p. 35. & Pet. Crab. Conc. Tom. 1. pag. 945. Col. 2. The words are theſe; *Unde Sanctiſſimus & Beatiſſimus Papa, Caput Univerſalis Eccleſiæ, &c.*

in the Council of *Chalcedon*, theſe Words occur in the Latin Copies—*The moſt holy and moſt bleſſed Pope* Leo, *Head of the Univerſal Church:* Where theſe words — *Head of the Univerſal Church*, are not in the Greek Copies; (as that Learned Archbiſhop ingenuouſly and truly (r) Confeſſeth) but (by Roman Arts) falſly and baſely interſerted, that ſo they might by fraud (what by no Reaſon they can) maintain, the Pope's impiouſly uſurped Supremacy. And that we may know, how unpleaſing the publiſhing of ſuch things (though evidently true) are to the Pope and his Party at *Rome*, (who are reſolved, in deſpight of truth) to maintain the Popes pretended Supremacy) this Learned Work of that great Roman Catholick Archbiſhop (ſ), is damn'd by the Inquiſitors, not to be printed, read, or had by any. He who ſeriouſly reads (and underſtands) the Latin Verſions of the Greek Councils, Fathers, and other Greek and Latin Writers, may find an hundred ſuch Frauds, to maintain (what they know they have no juſt reaſon for) their Papal and Antichriſtian Tyranny: And their *Indices Expurgatorij* are Authentick Evidences, to Convince them of theſe Unchriſtian Practiſes, to conceal truth, and coſen the World into a belief of their pernicious Papal Errors. Nor is this all, (nor the worſt) for ſo deſperately are they ſet upon it, that if their Intereſt and the Papal Monarchy cannot otherwiſe be maintain'd (as 'tis impoſſible it ſhould by any juſt and lawful means,

(r) Abſunt à Contextu Græco, verba illa, *Caput Univerſalis*, &c. loco dicto, in margine.

(ſ) Vide Indicem Librorum Prohibitorum Alexand. 7. Juſſu Editum, Romæ, Ann. 1664. verbo, De Concordia Sacerdotij, &c. p. 29. & p. 352. ubi extat Decretum Congrationis Jndicis, in quo damnatur hic Petri de Marca Liber.

means) they ſpeak impiouſly and blaſphemouſly of our bleſſed Saviour. *Thomas Campegius Epiſcopus Feltrenſis*, in his Book of the Power of the Pope, to *Paul.* IV. ſays, —(t) *That our bleſſed Saviour had not been a Diligent Father of the Family, to his Church, unleſs he had left ſuch a Monarch over his Church, as the Pope*, of whom he is there ſpeaking: And he Cites Pope *Innocent*, and *Aquinas* to juſtifie it. *Albertus Pighius* is as high to the ſame impious purpoſe, and expreſly ſays —(u) *That our bleſſed Saviour had been wanting to his Church in things neceſſary, if he had not Conſtituted and left ſuch a Monarch and Judge of Controverſies.* And a great (x) Canoniſt (if that be poſſible) more blaſphemouſly ſays— *That our bleſſed Saviour, while he was on Earth, had power to pronounce the Sentence of Depoſition, and Damnation againſt the Emperor, or any other; And by the ſame Reaſon, His Vicar now can do it.* And then he impiouſly adds —*That our bleſſed Saviour would not have ſeem'd Diſcreet, unleſs he had left ſuch a Vicar, as could do all theſe things, &c.* So if it be granted (which is moſt evident and certainly true) that our bleſſed Saviour left no ſuch Monarchical Vicar, as the Pope; then they are not affraid to accuſe him of *want of Diligence and Diſcretion.* And this impious Gloſs is approved and confirm'd by Pope (y) *Gregory.* XIII. as (we may be ſure) what makes for his Extravagant Power and Papal Monarchy (how Erroneous and Impious ſoever) ſhall not want his Approbation. And thus much of the

(t) *Non fuiſſet Chriſtus Diligens Pater-familias, ſi non dimiſiſſet in Terrâ aliquem qui Vice ſuâ poſſit ſubvenire neceſſitatibus Eccleſiæ*, &c. De Poteſtat. Rom. Pontif. cap. 1. §. 3. pag. 2.

(u) *Chriſtus Eccleſiæ Defuiſſet, nec de Neceſſariis proſpexiſſet, Niſi Monarcham aliquem & ſuæ cem Conſtituiſſet*, &c. Vide Albert. Pighium Controverſ. 3. fol. 70. 71. 76.

(x) *Chriſtus dum fuit in Mundo, de jure naturali, in Imperatorem & Quoſcunque Alios Depoſitionis Sententias ferre potuiſſet, & Damnationis* ——*& Eadem Ratione & Vicarius ejus poteſt. Nam non videretur Dominus Diſcretus fuiſſe, niſi amicum poſt ſe Talem Vicarium reliquiſſet. Fuit autem iſte Vicarius Petrus: & idem dicendum eſt de Succeſſoribus Petri.* Ita Petrus Bertrandus in Addit. ad Gloſſas ad Cap. Unam Sanctam. 1. De Major. & Obed. Extrav. Commun.

(y) Vide Bullam Greg. 13. dat. Rom. 1. Julij, Ann. 1580. præfixam. Corp. Juris Can. Pariſ. 1612. & 1618.

the third Priviledge of the Apoſtles, their *Univerſal Juriſdiction*; equally in them all, in *James*, and *John*, and *Paul* as much as *Peter*; and this Juriſdiction Perſonal to all, and never tranſmitted to any of their Succeſſors.

4. Beſides the Immediate call of the Apoſtles, their Power of doing Miracles, and their Univerſal Juriſdiction over all the World; they were (all of them) θεόπνευστοι, Divinely Inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt, ſo that they had Infallibility, ſo far, as whatever they preach'd or writ was Divine, and the undoubted Word of God. This Priviledge alſo was Perſonal, nor ever was Communicated to any of their Succeſſors. I know that the (z) Canoniſts and (a) Jeſuits, (in the laſt and worſt of times) would make the World believe (without any ſhadow of rational ground) that *Peter* transferred his Infallibility to the Pope, and made him the Infallible Judge of all Controverſies of Faith, and Fact too. A thing ſo evidently falſe, and without any poſſibility of proof, that 'tis a wonder, that any ſhould have the Confidence to aſſert it, eſpecially in *Paris*, the great Metropolis of a Church which conſtantly does, and has deny'd the Popes Infallibility and Superiority to a General Council. 2. But that which might for ever ſilence this Irrational and Injuſt Claim of Infallibility in the Pope, is, that (for Matter of Fact) none of them, (though they were ſometimes nibling at a kind of Supremacy) for above a Thouſand Years after our bleſſed Saviour, either

(z) *Sic Omnes Apoſtolicæ Sedis Sanctiones accipiendæ ſunt, tanquam Ipſius divini Petri voce firmatæ ſint.* Can. ſic Omnes. 2. Diſt. 19. And this the Gloſs there indeavours to prove, from a ſpurious and ridiculous, as well as impious Canon. Can. Non Nos. 1. Diſt. 40.

(a) The Jeſuits in their Theſis propoſed in the *Claromont* Coll. 12. Decemb. Ann. 1661. Impudently and Impiouſly ſay, *Chriſtus Eccleſiæ regimen primum Petro, dein Succeſſoribus Commiſit, & Eandem quam habebat Ipſe, Infallibilitatem, Conceſſit, quoties ex Cathedrâ loqueretur.* And then. Theſ. 20. tells us——*Datur Infallibilis Controverſiarum Judex, etiam Extra Concilium Generale, Tum in Quæſtionibus Juris, tum facti.*

ther did or dared pretend to Infallibility; and if they had, they had made themſelves ridiculous. For, 3. It was notoriouſly known, that ſeveral of their Popes were Hereticks. For inſtance, (*b*) *Liberius*, (*c*) *Honorius*, (*d*) *Vigilius*, *&c.* And for Hereſie Condemn'd in General Councils, as is evident from the Acts themſelves. and has been demonſtrated, not only by Proteſtants, but by very Learned men of the Roman Communion. 4. And he who ſeriouſly reads, and impartially conſiders their Papal Bulls, Breves, and Decretal (*e*) Conſtitutions; and in them how ridiculouſly they reaſon, and prophane (rather than expound) Scripture; will have abundant reaſon to believe, that thoſe Popes were ſo far from Infallibility, that their own Writings Convince them guilty of Groſs Ignorance and Folly.

5. Laſtly, All the Apoſtles were *Fundamenta Eccleſiæ*, *Domus Dei*, Foundations of the Church, or Houſe of God, (as has before been evidently proved from Scripture) and this was in all the Apoſtles Extraordinary, and a Perſonal Apoſtolical Priviledge, to which, (as it was in the Apoſtles) none of their Succeſſors (no not the Pope,) ever did, or (with any reaſon) could pretend. And as this Apoſtolical Priviledge, ſo the other four before mention'd (1. *Immediate Vocation.* 2. *Power to work Miracles.* 3. *Univerſality of Juriſdiction.* 4. *Infallibility in all things they preach'd or writ.*) I ſay, all theſe Priviledges, were Extraordinary and Perſonal to the

(*b*) Hieronymus de Scriptoribus Eccleſiaſt in Fortunatiano.

(*c*) Vid. Hiſt. Hæreſis Monothlitarum, per Fran. de Combeſis Dominicanum. Pariſ. 1648. p. 65. &c. 121. &c. ubi contra Pighium, Baronium, &c. probat evidenter Honorium Synodo. 6. damnatum.

(*d*) Vid. D. Rich. Crakanthorp, in Vigilio dormitante.

(*e*) Let any man read thoſe two Conſtitutions before nam'd. 1. That of *Innocent.* 3. Cap. Solicitæ. 6. Extra de Major. & Obedient. &, 2. That of *Bonif.* 8. Cap. Unam Sanctam. 1. eodem Titulo. Extravag. Commun. and if he have eyes, and will Impartially uſe them, he will find what I ſay, true. Or he may (with the ſame ſucceſs) read the Bulls and Damnations of the Emperor *Hen.* 4. by *Greg.* 7. in Bull. Rom. 1638. Tom. 1. p. 49. 50. 51. And of *Freder.* 2. Ibid. p. 94. 95. by *Innoc.* 4. And the Excommunications of the ſame Emperor, by *Greg.* 9. Ann. 1239. Ibid. in dicto Bullario. Tom. 1. p 89. 90.

the Apoſtles, and never were tranſmitted to any of their Succeſſors. And this being granted, (as of neceſſity it ought and muſt) it will evidently follow, that *Peter* neither had, nor could have, that Monarchical Supremacy over the Apoſtles and Univerſal Church, to which the Pope and his Party vainly, and without any reaſon or ground pretend. For that Papal Supremacy and Monarchy they pretend *Peter* had, (according to their Hypotheſis) conſiſted principally, in the Univerſality of his Juriſdiction over the whole Church, and his Infallibility, as a Judge, to determine Controverſies of Faith; both which every Apoſtle had, as much and as well as he) and therefore it was impoſſible, that (in theſe reſpects) he ſhould have any Superiority (much leſs Supremacy) over the other Apoſtles, more than they over him; eſpecially, ſeeing in Scripture, (to men who have good Eyes, and will Impartially uſe them) there is not one Syllable looks that way. Nay, ſeeing our bleſſed Saviour hath expreſly determin'd the contrary. The Apoſtles were diſputing and reaſoning amongſt themſelves, which of them ſhould be *greateſt*: (they had their Infirmities and ambitious deſires). But our Saviour tells them —(*f*) *Whoſoever will be great among you* (though *Peter* be the man) *let him be their Miniſter*; *and whoſoever will be* (g) *chief, let him be your Servant.* And again,—(*h*) *Be not ye call'd Maſters, for one is your Maſter, even Chriſt* (not *Peter*) *and ye are Brethren*; *but*

(*f*) Matth.20.26.27.

(*g*) Πρῶτος, Primus ſeu Princeps, (plus eſt quam eſſe Magnum) aliis Omnibus Major (yet this the Pope would have). Luc. Burgenſis. in Matth.20.27.

(*h*) Matth. 23.8. 9. 10.11.

be

he that will be greateſt among you, ſhall be your Servant. The Apoſtles had no Maſter under Heaven, but their bleſſed Saviour; it was of him, and him Only, that they learned the Goſpel, and that Immediately; they had it not from (*i*) *any man*, nor one from another. Our bleſſed Saviour *was their only Maſter and Superior*, and they his *Scholars, ſubordinate to him*, and co-ordinate amongſt *themſelves.* He tells them, *that they are Brethren*; *Condiſcipuli*, Schoolfellows. Names which (in themſelves, and in their Maſter's meaning) import Equality; eſpecially as to any Juriſdiction one over another. There may be amongſt Scholars of the ſame School, and Brethren, an inequality, (and ſo there was amongſt the Apoſtles) 1. In reſpect *of Age*; Some might be elder, ſome younger. 2. *In reſpect of their coming to that School*; ſome might come before others; So *Andrew* was firſt call'd to our bleſſed Saviours School, (before *Peter* ★). 3. *In reſpect of Natural Parts and Abilities*, ſome might have greater Capacities then others. 4. *In reſpect of their Maſters Love and Kindneſs*, he might love one more then another, So amongſt the Twelve, *John* was the *belovod Diſciple.* Such inequality there was amongſt them, and we willingly grant it. But to ſay, (as the Pope, and many of his Party moſt vainly do) that amongſt theſe *Brethren*, and *Schoolfellows* in our bleſſed Saviour's School, *Peter*, (or any other) had not only an *Authority and Juriſdiction*, but *a Monarchical Supremacy*, over

(*i*) Gal. 1. 1.

★Joh. 1. 40, 41, &c.

all the reſt, this is ſo contradictory to our bleſſed Saviour's plain words, and the manifeſt and undoubted meaning of them; that were it not, that we know men may be ſway'd with worldly Intereſts, and ſometimes have ſtrong Deluſions to believe a Lye; it were incredible that any Learned men ſhould (with ſo much Confidence, and no Reaſon, aſſert the Contrary. To paſs by all Teſtimonies of Ancient Fathers for many hundred years, and many ſober Papiſts before *Luther*, (who neither knew, nor believed *Peter's* Monarchy over the Church and his fellow Apoſtles, his Equals) ſure I am, 1. That *Francis* (k) *Lucas Brugenſis*, a Roman Catholick (in our days) eminent in their Church for Dignity and Learning, ſays the ſame thing I have done (and on the ſame Texts) for the Equality of the Apoſtles, againſt *Peter's* pretended Monarchy. 2. And a greater then he, (I mean, (*l*) *Petrus de Marca* Archbiſhop of *Paris*) convinc'd with the Evidence of the former Texts, and Truth, was of Opinion, and has publiſh'd it to the World, That our bleſſed Saviour, at his Aſcenſion, did not leave the Church eſtabliſh'd in *Peter*, and a Monarchy; But in an *Ariſtocratie*, or the *Colledge of the Apoſtles*. In which Colledge *Peter* was one, not Superior (much leſs a Monarch) to the other Apoſtles; and the Apoſtles left the Government of the Church Eſtabliſh'd in the Biſhops, and *Ariſtocratical*; only he thinks, that both in the Colledge of the Apoſtles, and Councils of Biſhops after them, their

(k) Matth. 23. 8. *Omnes autem vos fratres eſtis.* On which words, *Luc. Brugenſis* ſaith thus—— *Quia fratres ſumus, Nemivem in alios Magiſterio fungi Concedit* —— *Fratres non Magiſtri Alii in Alios*——*eſtis Condiſcipuli, nemo in alium proprie agere poteſt Magiſtrum. Nullus aliorum Magiſterium mereatur, ſe habere vos Omnes merito debeatis Condiſcipulos. Chriſtus Solus Omnium Magiſter agnoſcendus.* Ita L. Brugenſis Commentar. in 4. Evang. ad 23. Math. 8. p. 361. vid. Hieronym. in Gal. 2. 1. ubi dicit Petrum, Paulum, & reliquos Apoſtolos fuiſſe æquales.

(l) *Sed quia Eccleſia regenda eſt juxta unitatem, neceſſarium fuit, Inſtitui ab Apoſtolis modum quendam Communionis inter Epiſcopos, ſecundum Exemplum, A Chriſto datum in Inſtitutione Collegij Apoſtolici; quod Univerſum Eccleſiæ Corpus repræſentabat: Ideoque præſcribenda ab iis fuit forma regiminis, Ariſtocratici nimirum, ita ut unus Præſideret.* Pet. de Marca de Concordia Sacerdotij & Imperij, lib. 6. cap. 1. §. 2. pag. 58. Col. 1.

there was (for Orders ſake) to be a Preſident, (not a Monarch, for that was Inconſiſtent with *Ariſtocratie*) And (if this will content them) we will grant it. Becauſe we do know, that the Ancient Church allow'd the Pope the prime Place and Precedency in Councils, (for Orders ſake) and that not by any *Divine Right*, (which was not in thoſe days, ſo much as pretended to) but becauſe *Rome* was the (*m*) Imperial City, and Metropolis of the *Roman Empire*; the greatneſs of the City uſually giving greatneſs and precedency to the Biſhops; ſuch were *Conſtantinople*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, *&c.* I know the Inquiſitors at *Rome* have damned this Book of (*n*) *Petrus de Marca*, but this is no Argument, that what he has ſaid, is not true; *Grande aliquod bonum eſt; quod à Nerone* (*ab Inquiſitoribus*) *damnatur.* To conclude this Point, if our Adverſaries aſſent not to this manifeſt Truth, as (being Contradictory to their worldly Intereſt and miſconceived Infallible Pretenſions) 'tis probable they will not; I ſhall make them this (to all unprejudiced Lovers of Truth) fair offer. Let them give me any one cogent Argument from Scripture or Univerſal Tradition (and nothing elſe can do it) whereby they can prove, the following Poſitions; I will thank God and them for the diſcovery, and promiſe hereby to be their Proſelyte.

1. If they can (by any ſuch Argument) prove that *Peter* (by *Divine Right*) had ſuch a Monarchical Supremacy and Juriſdiction over the Apoſtles,

(*m*) Conc. Chalcedon. Can. 28. Conc. Conſtant. 1. Can. 5. apud P. Crabb. Conc. Tom. 1. pag. 411.

(*n*) But it is not only *Pet. de Marca*, but even the Popiſh General Councils of *Piſa*, *Conſtance*, and *Baſil*, and the *Gallican* Church and *Sorbon*, and the Ancient Church for a thouſand years after our bleſſed Saviour, which maintain'd the ſame Doctrine *Marca* did; as is evidently proved by a Learned *Sorbon* Doctor, *Edm. Rechier.* In Hiſt. Conc. General. l. 1. Edit. Colon. Ann. 1680. The deſign of the whole Book is againſt the Popes Monarchical Supremacy and Infallibility. Vide dicti lib. cap. 13. pag. 393. &c.

Apoſtles, and the whole Church, (as is vainly pretended) I will yield the Cauſe. But if he had no ſuch Power, 'tis impoſſible he ſhould tranſmit the Power (he never had) to his Succeſſors.

2. Let it be ſuppos'd, (which yet is evidently untrue) that St. *Peter* had ſuch a Monarchical Authority and Juriſdiction, even over the reſt of the Apoſtles, let them prove by any ſuch Argument as is before mention'd; that it was not only Temporal, & his only for his life; that it was not to have an end and period with his Perſon. For if it was, then his Succeſſor (whoever he be) can have no pretence to it. For 'tis impoſſible, that any Succeſſor, can have any legal or juſt Claim to that Power, which vaniſh'd and ceas'd to be, with his Predeceſſor, who poſſeſs'd it only for his life.

3. Admit both theſe to be true, (which yet are equally and evidently falſe) that *Peter had ſuch a Power*, and that it was *not Perſonal*, but to be tranſmitted to his Succeſſor, ſeeing ſuch tranſmiſſion muſt either be done by our bleſſed Saviour immediately, or (by Power deriv'd from him) by *Peter*. Let our Adverſaries make it appear, that either our bleſſed Saviour himſelf, or *Peter* (by Power deriv'd from him) did actually tranſmit that Power to any Succeſſor, and I ſubmit.

4. Laſtly, Suppoſe all theſe to be (what not one of them is) true; yet unleſs it do appear, that the Biſhop of *Rome* (and not the Biſhop of *Antioch*, (where they ſay *Peter* was Biſhop firſt) was that

that Succeſſor of St. *Peter*, to whom ſuch Supremacy was tranſmitted; he can have no pretence to it. For in this Caſe, *Idem eſt non eſſe & non apparere*. Let our Adverſaries then make it appear, that either our bleſſed Saviour immediately by himſelf, or *Peter* (by Authority from him) did (*o*) tranſmit the Supremacy to the Pope, and we ſhall be ſatisfy'd; and thankful for the Diſcovery. And this brings me to the Second thing propoſed before.

(*o*) I know that ſome of them (eminent for Learning and Dignity in their Church) ſay; That our bleſſed Saviour did give *Peter* power to transfer his great Authority to his Succeſſor, and only to him, not to any of the other Apoſtles; But this they ſay only, without any pretence of proof. And I commend their Prudence, not to attempt Impoſſibilities. Johan. Franciſcus Bordinus Archbiſhop of *Avignion*, has publiſhed his Opinion, in theſe words — *Chriſtus Univerſale Totius Eccleſiæ Caput Petrum Conſtituit, qui ſuas Vices in Terris ageret. Quo quidem in Munere, & ſi dum viveret, Æquales* (mark that) *habuit cæteros Coapoſtolos, Nullis tamen Eorum, quod à Domino accipiſſent, jus per Succeſſionem in alios transferendi facultas fuit. Soli Petro Id Promiſſum, Soli Petro Id Traditum, ut Petra eſſet, & poſt Chriſtum Eccleſiæ fundamentum.* Ita Johan. Fran. Bordinus Archiepiſcopus Avenionenſis, in Serie & Geſtis Roman. Pontif. ad Clement. Papam. 8. ad Annum Chriſt. 34. Tiberij. 18.

2. The thing next to be enquired after is, Whether, and how it may appear that the Biſhop of *Rome* is *Peters* Succeſſor. Our Adverſaries ſay, (and vainly ſay it only) that *Peter* was *Supream Head* (after our bleſſed Saviour's Aſcenſion) and *Monarch of the Church*; and from him, (*Jure Succeſſionis*) the Pope derives his *Monarchical Power and Supremacy*; and that by the *Inſtitution and* (p) *Command of our bleſſed Saviour*, and ſo not by *Humane*, but (*q*) *Divine Right*. This is a Poſition of greateſt Conſequence, and will require good proof.

2.

(p) *Petrus Romæ Sedem ſuam, Jubente Domino, Collocavit:* Bellarm. de Rom. Pontif. l. 2. c. 1. §. 1.

(q) *Probatur, Roman. Pontificem Petro Succedere, in Pontificatu Eccleſiæ Univerſæ Ex Divino Jure, & Ratione Succeſſionis.* Bellarmin. Ibid. lib. 2. cap. 12. §. Primum ergo. *Papa in Petri Cathedrâ Sedet, ſummum in eo dignitatis gradum, & Juriſdictionis amplitudinem, non Humanis Conſtitutionibus, ſed Divinitus datum agnoſcit: eſt Pater Univerſalis Eccleſiæ Petri Succeſſor, & Chriſti Vicarius,* &c. Catechiſm. Trident. Part. 2. cap. 7. §. 28. pag. 391. Edit. Pariſ. 1635.

Nor

Nor is it poſſible to prove the Biſhop of *Rome* to be *Peter*'s Succeſſor in that Biſhoprick, unleſs it firſt appear that *Peter* was his Predeceſſor in that See. *Linus*, *Clemens* or *Cletus* cannot (with any Truth or Senſe) be ſaid to ſucceed *Peter*, unleſs it appear firſt, that he preceeded them. Our Adverſaries (I confeſs) do conſtantly (with great noiſe and confidence) affirm, That *Peter* did preceed in the Biſhoprick of *Rome*; but ſure I am, that hitherto, they have not brought any, ſo much as probable (much leſs cogent and concluding) Reaſon to prove it: nor do I think it poſſible they ſhould bring (what they neither have, nor can have) any true and concluding proof, to prove (what this is) an erroneous and falſe Poſition. And that this may not be begg'd and *gratis dictum*, I ſhall offer to the Impartial Reader, theſe Conſiderations.

1. When they (*r*) ſay, That *Peter* fix'd his Epiſcopal Chair at *Rome*, *Jubente Domino*: Let them ſhew that (*ſ*) *Command*, and there will be an end of the Controverſie; we will obey our bleſſed Saviour's Command, and the Pope too. But this they have neither done, nor can: It being impoſſible, they ſhould ſhew that to be, which never was, nor ever had any being.

2. That ever *Peter* was at *Rome*, (much leſs that he was Biſhop there, for Five and twenty years (as is vainly pretended) cannot be made appear out of *Scripture*, or any Apoſtolical or Authentick Record; and therefore that he was there at all, (where he might be, as he was in many

(*r*) Bellarm. Locis proxime citatis, (ut & alij paſſim). And Pope *Pius*. 5. in this his Impious Bull. §. 1. *Chriſtus Eccleſiam Catholicam uni ſoli Petro Petrique Succeſſori Romano Pontifici in Poteſtatis Plenitudine Tradidit Gubernandam.*

(*ſ*) *Nullum Chriſti, ea dere, Decretum Extat.* So A Lapide Confeſſes; in Apoc. 17. verſ. 17. pag. 268. Col. 2. A.

many other good Cities, and not Biſhop of any of them) muſt depend ſolely upon *human and fallible Teſtimonies*, (I ſay, Teſtimonies certainly fallible, if not abſolutely falſe; which many Learned men have, and do believe). Now ſeeing the whole Papal Monarchy and Infallibility, depend upon *Peter's* being Biſhop of *Rome*, and the grounds we have to aſſure us, that he ever was there, are fallible and dubious; and ſeeing it is irrational (if not impoſſible) that any conſidering Perſon, ſhould give a firm and undoubted aſſent to any Concluſion, inferr'd only upon fallible and dubious premiſſes. Hence it evidently follows, That our Faith and belief of the Papal Monarchy and Infallibility is, and (till they find better, and more neceſſary premiſſes) muſt be fallible and dubious. And here I deſire to be inform'd how it comes to be an Article of Faith, in their new *Roman Creed*; *That the Biſhop of* Rome *is Vicar of Chriſt, and* (t) Peter's *Succeſſor*; which Article (with the reſt in that Creed) *they promiſe*, (u) *ſwear and vow, to believe and profeſs moſt Conſtantly, to their laſt breath.* With what Conſcience their Church can require, or they take ſuch an Oath, *Moſt Conſtantly and firmly to believe, to their laſt breath*, ſuch things, for the belief of which, they have no grounds (if any) ſave only fallible and very dubious, *Ipſi viderint.*

3. I know, that the Aſſertors of the Papal Monarchy (according to their Intereſt) are very deſirous to prove out of Scripture, that *Peter* was

(t) *Romano Pontifici, Beati Petri Apoſtolorum Principis, Succeſſori, ac Chriſti Vicario, veram Obedientiam ſpondeo ac juro.* Vid. Bullam Pii. 4. ſuper forma Juramenti Profeſſionis fidei, in Conc. Trident. Seſſ. 24. p. 452. Edit. Antv. 1633.

(u) *Hanc Catholicam fidem, extra quam nemo Salvus eſſe poteſt, quam in Præſenti profiteor, & teneo, eandem uſque ad ultimum vitæ ſpiritum Conſtantiſſime retinere, &c. Spondeo, Voveo, Juro.* Ibidem.

was at *Rome*; and to that end produce thoſe words in his firſt *Epiſtle*—(x) *The Church which is at* Babylon *ſalutes you:* And by *Babylon*, they ſay, the Apoſtle meant *Rome:* And for this, they cite *Papias* in (y) *Euſebius*, *That by* Babylon, Rome *is figuratively to be underſtood.* So that (if this be true) *Peter* writ that *Epiſtle* at *Babylon*; that is, at *Rome*, and ſo muſt be at *Rome* when he writ it: And the proof of this depends upon the Authority of *Papias* Biſhop of *Hierapolis*, and thoſe who follow him. Now how little Credit is to be given to *Papias* in this, (or any thing elſe) will manifeſtly appear out of the ſame *Euſebius*; who tells us, 1. *That* Papias *was much given to Tradition*; (z) *inquiring* (of the Elders who had heard the Apoſtles) *what* Peter, *or* James, *or* John, *&c. had ſaid: thinking he got leſs benefit by reading Scriptures, then by the talk of thoſe who heard the Authors of them.* 2. *That he had by ſuch* (a) *Tradition, ſtrange Parables and Preachings of our bleſſed Saviour, and other things very Fabulous: Such as the Hereſie of the Milleneries; which he believed and propagated. That he thus err'd, by* (b) *Miſunderſtanding the Apoſtles Doctrine: For* (as *Euſebius* goes on) *he was a man of very little underſtanding.* 4. *And yet* (as the ſame Author ſays) *he was the occaſion that,* (c) *moſt of the Eccleſiaſtical Writers who followed him* (*Reverencing his Antiquity*) *err'd with him.*

(x) 1 Pet. 5. 13.

(y) *Primam Petri Epiſtolam Romæ Scriptam* (φασὶν) *aiunt, quam Petrus, τροπικώτερον Βαβυλῶνα appellat.* Euſebius Hiſt. l. 2. c. 15. p. 53. B. Valeſio.

(z) *Curioſè ſciſcitabar* (ſaid *Papias*) *à Senioribus, quid Petrus, quid Jacobus, dicere ſoliti eſſent. Néque ex Bibliorum Lectione, tantam me utilitatem capere poſſe Exiſtimabam, quantam ex hominum vivâ voce.* Euſeb. l. 3. c. 39. p. 111.

(a) Ἐκ παραδόσεως ἀγράφου, *Ex Traditione non ſcriptâ habuit novas quaſdam Servatoris parabolas & prædicationes, aliáque Fabulis propiora; inter quæ Mille Annorum ſpatium poſt reſurrectionem, fore dicit.* Euſeb. ibid. p. 112.

(b) *Ita opinatus videtur Papias, ex male Intellectis Apoſtolorum narrationibus. Fuit enim Mediocri Admodum Ingenio Præditus.* Euſeb. ibidem. Lit. c.

(c) *Pleriſque tamen poſt Ipſum Eccleſiaſticis Scriptoribus, Ejuſdem Erroris occaſionem præbuit, hominis vetuſtate, Sententiam ſuam tuentibus.* Ibidem D. Ita etiam Nicephorus Hiſt. Lib. 3. cap. 20. pag. 252. D.

I

I know, that in *Euſebius* (both in the worſt Edition of him, by (*d*) *Chriſtopherſon*, (ſometime a Popiſh Biſhop of *Chicheſter*) and the beſt by (*e*) *Hen. Valeſius*) we have a high Commendation of *Papias*; (*f*) *At the ſame time* (ſays *Euſebius*, as *Valeſius* renders him) *Papias was famous; a man very Eloquent and Learned, and well skill'd in Scripture.* But *Chriſtopherſon* (his other Tranſlator) goes higher, (as uſually he does when it makes for the Catholick Cauſe) and in his Tranſlation ſays more in Commendation of *Papias*, then is in the Text: For he tells us, *That* Papias (beſides his knowledge of Scripture) *was a man* (g) *certainly moſt learned in the Knowledge of All Other Arts.* Now if this be true, then that Character I have given him before, is not ſo; and then his Antiquity (which was (*h*) great) and his great Learning (in all Arts and Sciences, as well as Scripture) conſider'd; his Teſtimony, that *Babylon*, whence St. *Peter* writ, was *Rome*, will be more valid, and of greater Authority.

Object.

(*d*) Colon. Allobr. 1612.

(*e*) Pariſ. 1659.

(f) *Papias eadem ætate Celebris fuit; Vir Imprimis diſertus, & eruditus, ac Scripturarum peritus.* Euſeb. Hiſt. lib. 3. cap. 36. Edit. Valeſij: Sed in Edit. Chriſtopherſon. Cap. 35. Græ. 30. Latinæ Verſionis.

(g) *Omnium aliarum Artium ſcientiâ vir planè diſertiſſimus.* Ibidem.

(h) *Papias* was a friend and familiar of St. *Polycarpe*. Euſeb. Hiſt. lib. 3. cap. 39. and *Polycarpe* ſuffered Martyrdom Anno Chriſt. 167. Baronius Annotat. ad Martyrolog. Romanum, ad diem Jan. 26. p. 81. Col. 1.

Anſwer.

In Anſwer to this; I ſay, 1. That all this Commendation of *Papias* before mention'd, is ſo far from having any Authority from *Euſebius*, that 'tis a plain Forgery. *Euſebius* (as to this paſſage) is evidently corrupted; and this Commendation of *Papias* (by whoſe Ignorance or Knavery, I know not) ſhuffled into the Text, long after *Euſebius* his death. For, 2. *Ruffinus* (who Tranſlated *Euſebius* his Hiſtory above One thouſand two hundred years ago) in the place above quoted, ſays only thus—*About this time flouriſhed* Polycarpe

Biſhop of Smyrna, *and* Papias *Biſhop of* Hierapolis. So the Printed Edition of (*i*) *Ruffinus* by *B. Rhenanus*; and a very Ancient and Compleat MS. of *Ruffinus* (in my Keeping and Poſſeſſion) exactly (*k*) agrees with it; and there is not one word of that Commendation of *Papias*, which is now extant in *Euſebius*: And therefore we may Conclude, that Anciently it was not there, but the Text of *Euſebius* (by fraud or folly) is ſince Corrupted: For had it been in *Euſebius* when *Ruffin* Tranſlated him, there had been no reaſon he ſhould have left it out. 3. And which is yet more conſiderable, *Valeſius* (a very Learned Roman Catholick) who laſt publiſhed *Euſebius*, Ingenuouſly Confeſſes, that of three or four Greek MSS. of *Euſebius*, which he made uſe of in his Edition, not any *one of them* (l) *had that Commendation of* Papias; *and therefore he doubts not, but theſe words were* (m) *added by ſome Ignorant Scholiaſt, contrary to the Judgment and Senſe of* Euſebius. *For* (ſays (n) he) *how is it poſſible that* Euſebius *ſhould call* Papias *a Moſt Learned Man, and Moſt Skill'd in Scripture, who in the ſame* (o) *Book ſays, he was A Rude and Simple Perſon, of Very Little Wit or Judgment.* And his Ignorance eſpecially appears (as in other things) in that

1. He ſays *that* Philip, *whoſe Daughters were Propheteſſes, was* Philip *the* (p) *Apoſtle*; when the (q) Text, (had he read or remembred it) expreſly ſays, *That it was* Philip *the Deacon.*

2. *Papias*

(i) *Quibus Temporibus floruit Polycarpus Smyrnæorum Epiſcopus, & Papias Similiter Apud Hierapolim Sacerdotium gerens.* Ruffin. l. 3. c. 35. in Excuſo Rhenarci. Baſil. 1528.

(k) In Cod. MS. Ruffini, eſt. Lib. 3. cap. 32.

(l) *Totum hoc Elogium Papiæ deeſt in noſtris Codicibus.* Valeſius in Not. ad Lib. 3. Euſebij. c. 36. p. 55.

(m) *Non dubito, quin hæc verba ab Imperito Scholiaſte adjecta ſunt, præter Euſebij mentem & Sententiam.* Valeſius Ibidem.

(n) *Quomodo fieri poteſt ut Euſebius Papiam hic appellet virum doctiſſimum, & ſcripturarum peritiſſimum, cum in fine Libri affirmat diſerte, Papiam Mediocri Ingenio præditum, Planéque Rudem ac Simplicem.* Valeſius Ibidem.

(o) Euſeb. lib. 3. c. 39.

(p) Euſeb. Hiſt. lib. 3. c. 39. p. 112. Valeſij Edit. vide Nicephor. lib. 3. c. 20.

(q) Act. 21. 8. Vide Nicephor. Hiſt. lib. 3. pag. 252. C.

2. *Papias* ſaid, (and in his Writings publiſhed his Opinion) *That hearing* (r) *Oral Traditions, was more profitable, then reading Scriptures*). That is, to hear the Stories and Tales of private and fallible Perſons (and that in Matters of Religion) was more profitable, then to read the Sacred Oracles of God, penn'd by Divinely Inſpired Infallible Perſons. St. (*ſ*) *John* tells us, he had writ ſo many and ſuch things, as were neceſſary and ſufficient to Salvation, yet left out thouſands of things, which he thought not neceſſary. But *Papias* (with great Ignorance and Impiety) prefers the unwritten Tradition of thoſe things concerning our bleſſed Saviour, which the Apoſtles had omitted, as not neceſſary, nor ſo uſeful as thoſe things they had writ. And ſo in Contradiction to the Holy Spirit and St. *John* (his Infallible *Amanuenſis*) calls the Tradition of thoſe unwritten things more uſeful, which they had omitted as not uſeful at all. And this his Ignorance and want of Judgment further appears,

(r) Vide Euſeb. Hiſt. lib. 3. cap. 39. Hieronym. de Illuſt. Doct. cap. 18. Nicephor. l. 3. c. 20.

(*ſ*) Joh. 20. 30. 31. & 21. 25.

3. Becauſe *Euſebius* tells us, *That he had* (*amongſt his Traditions*) (t) *ſtrange and novel Parables and Doctrines of our bleſſed Saviour, and other things more Fabulous*; and amongſt them his *Millenary Hereſie*, of which he was Father, and (to the Infecting many others) did propagate it: And he fell to thoſe wild Opinions chiefly by his Ignorance and Miſunderſtanding of Scripture; as *Euſebius* and *Nicephorus* tell us. And yet this ſimple Perſon, and Arch-Heretick, is the prin-

(t) Ξένας τέ τινας, &c. *Novas quaſdam Servatoris parabolas ac prædicationes.*

cipal and prime Witneſs *Rome* has, to prove that *Babylon* (in the Epiſtle of *Peter*) ſignifies *Rome*, and that *Peter* was there. For other place in Scripture, they have none, and only *Papias* (and his Followers) for that. By the Premiſſes, I think it may appear to Impartial Perſons, That ſeeing *Papias* preferr'd Tradition (or ſome mens talk before the Scriptures) that he was a man of very weak *underſtanding*, and err'd by miſunderſtanding Scripture, that he writ Fables rather than Hiſtory, and maintain'd the *Millenary Opinion*, which *Rome* now calls *Hereſie*: I ſay theſe things Conſider'd, his Authority and Credit is, (if any at all) very little; and yet 'tis all our Adverſaries have (his Followers Teſtimonies being derived from, and depending upon his) to prove out of Scripture, that *Peter* writ that Epiſtle at *Rome*, or ever was there. This is a Truth ſo manifeſt, that not only (*u*) *Proteſtants*, but moſt Learned *Roman* (x) *Catholicks*, ſay and prove; that *Peter* writ that Epiſtle, not at *Rome*, but *Babylon* in *Chaldea*. And further; that he did not write it at *Rome*, will be evident from Scripture, and what their own moſt Learned Author Confeſſes. For, 1. (*y*) *Baronius* tells us, *It was writ, Anno Chriſti* 45. 2. To make this probable, both he, *Petavius*, and others, generally ſay; *That* Peter *went to* Rome *in the ſecond year of* Claudius; which was *Anno Chriſti* 44. 3. But this a very Learned *Roman Catholick* evidently (*z*) Confutes from Scripture, and good Authorities;

(u) *Scaliger in Annotat. in* Joh. 18.31. *Petrus Romæ nunquam fuit: ſed prædicabat τῇ διασπορᾷ Aſiæ, Cujus Metropolis erat Babylon, ex quâ ſcribit Epiſtolam ſuam.* Vid. Johan. Rainoldum contra Hartum, &c.

(x) *Tametſi Veteres Exiſtimaverint Petrum vocabulo Babylonis ſignificaſſe Urbem Romam, probabilis eſt Scaligeri Conjectura; qui ex Ipſa Babylone ſcriptam à Petro putat Epiſtolam hanc ad Judæos diſperſos*, &c. Petrus de Marca Archiepiſcopus Pariſienſis. De Concordia Sacerd. & Imperij. l.6.c.1.§.4.p.59. Tom.2.

(*y*) Baronius Annal. Tom.1.ad Annum Chriſti 45. §. 16. 17.

(*z*) *Hæc Sententia refelli videtur ex Actis Apoſtolorum, ex quibus conſtat Petrum, in Judæa ac Syriâ ſemper manſiſſe, uſque ad ultimum Annum Agrippæ, &c.* Hen. Valeſius in Notis ad Cap.16.l.2. Hiſt.Eccleſ.Euſebij pag. 33.34.

thorities; and plainly ſhews, that *Peter* was always in *Judea* or *Syria*, till the death of *Herod Agrippa*, which was in the fourth year of *Claudius*, and the Six and fortieth year of our bleſſed Saviour. And therefore it was impoſſible that *Peter* ſhould write that Epiſtle at *Rome*, in the Five and fortieth year of our bleſſed Saviour, who never came thither till the year Forty ſix, unleſs they will ſay (and they do ſay things as impoſſible) that he writ an Epiſtle at *Rome* when he was not there. 4. Nay, 'tis certain from what *Luke* ſays in the (*a*) *Acts of the Apoſtles*, that *Peter* continued in *Judæa* till the Council met at *Jeruſalem* about the Queſtion concerning Circumciſion, and the Ceremonial Law. Sure it is, that he was preſent at that Council; which was *Anno Chriſti* 51. ſays (*b*) *Baronius*, *Bellarmine*, and others; the Learned (*c*) *Valeſius* thinks (and gives his reaſon for it, (more probable to me, then any brought for the Contrary Opinions) that the Council was held, *Anno Claudij.* 7. and *Chriſti.* 49. take which Computation you pleaſe, if St. *Peter* wrote that Epiſtle at *Rome*, *Anno Chriſti* 45. he muſt have writ there, ſeveral years before he came thither. 5. Nay, 'tis further Evident, (let that Council be when they will) that *Peter* was not at *Rome*, in the year. 51. which *Baronius* mentions, but at *Jeruſalem*. For St. (*d*) *Paul* tells us, that three years after his Converſion, (which was about the year. 37.) he went to *Jeruſalem* to ſee *Peter*, and found him there: And then

(*a*) Act. 15. &c.

(*b*) Baronius Annal. Tom. 1. ad Ann. 51. §. 6.

(c) *In Chronico Alexandrino Concilium Hieroſolymitanum refertur Anno Claudij.* 6. (*Chriſti.* 48.) *melius dixiſſet.* 7°. *ſic enim cuncta egregiè conveniunt, &c.* Hen. Valeſius in Notis ad Cap. 18. l. 2. Hiſt. Eccleſ. Euſeb. p. 37. Col. 2. A.

(*d*) Gal. 1. 18.

then (e) fourteen years after, (which was about the year. 51.) he went to *Jeruſalem* again, and then found *Peter* there. According to our Adverſaries Computation, in the year. 51. *Peter* had ſate Biſhop in *Rome* about (f) eight years; and yet St. *Paul* neither found, nor ſought him at *Rome* (where he was not) but at *Jeruſalem*, where he was, with the Jews, who were Committed to his Charge and Cure. 6. Laſtly, 'Tis Evident, St. *Peter* writ that firſt Epiſtle to the *Aſiatick* (g) *Diſperſion of the Jews*, of which *Babylon* was the Metropolis: And ſure it is, that when he ſays, *The Church of* Babylon *ſalutes you*; he intended (as all men do, who write Epiſtles of that Nature) that they ſhould know where he was, and who they were who ſaluted them; which was Impoſſible for them to do, if by *Babylon* he meant *Rome*. For at that time, *Rome* neither was, nor could be known to any by the name of *Babylon*; no Author (Sacred or Civil) having ever call'd it ſo. 'Tis true, St. *John* above (h) Fifty years after, calls *Rome*, *Babylon*. But he writing Myſterious Propheties, ſpoke (to uſe *Euſebius*'s word) τροπικώτερον, uſed many Types, Figures and Metaphors, to expreſs future things. But that *Peter*, who writ no ſuch Myſterious Prophetical Predictions, but the plain Duties, and Promiſes of the Goſpel, ſhould uſe ſuch Types or Figures, has neither truth nor any probability. By the Premiſſes, I hope it may appear, that it cannot be proved out of Scripture, that ever *Peter* was at *Rome*.

4. But

(e) Gal. 2. 1. 8. 9.

(f) They ſay, he ſate at *Rome*. 25. years, and that he was martyr'd *Neronis*. 13. or *Anno Chriſti*. 68. ſo that thoſe 25. years muſt begin *Anno Chriſti*. 43. And then *Anno Chriſti*. 51. he had ſate at *Rome* eight years.

(g) 1 Pet. 1. 1.

(h) The Firſt Epiſtle of *Peter* was writ *Anno Chriſti*. 45. So Baronius Annal. Tom. 1. ad Ann. 45. §. 16. And the ſame Baronius Annal. Tom. 1. ad Annum Chriſt. 97. §. 1. tells us, that the Revelation of St. *John* was writ *Anno Chriſti* 97. that is, 52. years after.

But let it be granted, that it could be proved out of Scripture (which is manifeſtly untrue) that *Peter* was at *Rome*, yet thence it will not follow that ever he was Biſhop there: much leſs for Five and twenty years, as is vainly pretended. For, 1. That he was Biſhop of *Rome* (or any place elſe) there is not one ſyllable in Scripture; and ſo from thence there can be no proof of his *Roman Biſhoprick*. And, 2. If it be granted (which is evidently untrue) that it could (out of Scripture) be clearly proved, that he was at *Rome* a longer time, yet hence it does not follow that he was Biſhop there: For he was at *Jeruſalem*, *Samaria*, *Joppa*, *&c.* (as is evident in Scripture) and yet our Adverſaries neither do, nor (with any ſenſe or reaſon) can ſay, that he was Biſhop of all thoſe places. 3. *Irenæus* (an ancient and an approved Author) expreſly ſays, (*i*) *That* Peter *and* Paul *Conſtituted* Linus *firſt Biſhop of* Rome; *That* Anacletus *ſucceeded him, and that* Clemens (*after the Apoſtles*) *was the third Biſhop there.* After him, *Euſebius* ſays the ſame thing; *That after the* (k) *Martyrdom of* Paul *and* Peter, Linus *was the firſt Biſhop of* Rome. And again, ſpeaking of the Biſhops of *Rome*, he ſays, *That* (*l*) Linus *was the firſt, and* Anencletus (or *Anacletus*, as he is uſually call'd) *the ſecond.* And though *Euſebius* ſay, *That* Linus *was* (m) *Primus poſt Petrum, the firſt Biſhop of* Rome *after* Peter; yet his meaning is not, that *Peter* was Biſhop of *Rome* before him, as is evident by what he ſays afterwards; *That* Cle-

(i) *Petrus & Paulus fundantes Eccleſiam Romanam, Lino Epiſcopatum tradiderunt. Succedit ei Anacletus, poſt eum Tertio Loco ab Apoſtolis Clemens.* Irenæus. lib. 3. cap. 3.

(k) Τῶν δὲ Ῥωμαίων; &c. *Poſt Pauli Petrique Martyrium, Primus Eccleſiæ Romanæ. Epiſcopatum ſuſcepit Linus.* Euſeb. Hiſt. l. 3. c. 2. vide Niceph. l. 3. cap. etiam. 2.

(l) Λῖνος δὲ ὁ πρῶτος, *Primus fuit Linus, ſecundus Anencletus.* Euſeb. Ibid. l. 3. c. 21.

(m) Euſeb. Ibid. lib. 3. cap. 4. πρῶτος μετὰ Πέτρον.

Clemens (*n*) *was the third Bishop of* Rome, *After the Apostles* Paul *and* Peter; and by what *Irenæus* said before him, *That* Clemens *was the third Bishop of* Rome *After the Apostles.* For if this be good consequence—*Linus was first Bishop of* Rome *after* Peter; Ergo, *Peter was Bishop of* Rome *too.* Then this (in *Irenæus* and *Eusebius*, who both say it,) will be good Consequence also; *Clemens was third Bishop of* Rome *after* Paul *and* Peter; Ergo, *Paul and Peter were both Bishops of* Rome. The truth is, that neither Consequence is good. *Irenæus* and *Eusebius* did indeed believe *Paul* and *Peter* Founders of the *Roman Church*, but neither of them to be Bishops there; which a Learned *Roman Catholick* evidently saw, and publickly (*o*) acknowledges. By the way, let me observe; That *Eusebius* in two places here (*p*) cited, puts *Paul* before *Peter:* and not only *Eusebius* (a fallible Author) but St. *Paul* himself puts *James* before (*q*) *Peter.* Now if *Eusebius* or St. *Paul* had known and believ'd St. *Peter* to have been (what the Pope and his Party, without any ground vainly Imagine) the *Supream Monarch over the whole Church and the Apostles themselves*; it had been a great Affront and Injury to St. *Peter*, and such an Incivility as St. *Paul* would not have been guilty of. 4. And 'tis yet more Considerable, what St. *Paul* says (*r*) in the place last cited; For there we have these things certain in the Text, 1. That *Peter* was the Apostle of the Circumcision; the Jews were Committed

(n) *Clemens*, μετὰ Παῦλον καὶ Πέτρου. *Tertius à Paulo & Petro Romæ Episcopus.* Euseb. loco dicto. cap. 21. vide Epiphanium adversus Hæreses. lib. 1. Hæres. 27. Carpocratianorum §. 6. pag. 107.

(o) *Sciendum est Eusebium Apostolos Inordine Episcoporum minime Numerare.* Hen. Valesius in Annotat. ad Hist. Ecclesiasticam Euseb. l. 3. c. 21. & Notarum. pag. 50. Col. 2. B.

(p) Lib. 3. Cap. 2. & Cap. 21.

(q) Gal. 2. 9.

(r) Gal. 2. 1. 7. 8. 9.

mitted to him, as his (*f*) Charge and Cure, as the *Gentiles* to *Paul*. 2. It was our bleſſed Saviour who (*t*) *Commiſſion'd both of them*, and appointed them thoſe Provinces; for none elſe could. He only could aſſign them their Provinces, who gave them the Apoſtolical Power to govern them. *Peter* (as our Adverſaries ſay) was *Supream Monarch of the whole Church*, had no Superior but our bleſſed Saviour, and ſo none elſe to Commiſſion him, or Appoint him his Province. 3. Both of them till that time, had diligently, and (with great Succeſs) effectually labour'd in their (*u*) *ſeveral Provinces*; *Peter* amongſt the *Jews*, *Paul* amongſt the *Gentiles*. 4. By a mutual Agreement, they (*x*) conſent and promiſe, *That* Peter (*as he had* (y) *before*, *ſo*) *for* (z) *the future*, *He ſhould go to the Jews*, *and make them his Charge and Cure*, *and* Paul *to the Gentiles*. 5. And this Agreement was about the year of our Lord 51. when (according to our Adverſaries Computation) he was, and had been Biſhop of *Rome* Eight or Nine years. 6. I deſire then to know, Whether *Peter* (after this Conſent and Agreement of the Apoſtles) continued Biſhop of the *Gentiles* at *Rome*, (as our Adverſaries pretend he did) or not? If he did, he contradicted his Commiſſion, which our bleſſed Saviour had given him, to be the Apoſtle of the Circumciſion, and Neglected the *Jews*, whom he had (*a*) *Concredited* to his care, and *Committed to him*, as his proper Charge. For to take the charge of the *Gentiles* and *Jews* too, was not only againſt his Commiſſion, but

(*f*) Gal. 2. 7.

(*t*) *Unus & idem mihi Evangelium præputij, & Petro Circumciſionis credidit; me miſit ad Gentes, Illum poſuit in Judæa.* Hieronymus in Cap. 2. ad Galatas. d.

(*u*) Verſ. 8.

(*x*) Verſ. 9.

(*y*) As is evident in the Acts of the Apoſtles, and by his firſt Epiſtle writ (as *Baronius* ſays) Ann 45. Chriſti. Annal. Tom. 1. ad Ann. 45. Num. 16. vid. Euſeb. Hiſt. l. 3. c. 1. where he ſays, that *Peter* preach'd the Goſpel long to the *Aſiatick* Diſperſion of the *Jews*, before he came to *Rome*; and *Nicephorus* ſays ſo too.

(*z*) And 'tis certain, that after the year. 51. (of which we now ſpeak) he took the *Jews* for his Charge and Cure: as is evident from his two Epiſtles writ to them, Ann. 68. And the Confeſſion of *Baronius*, Annal. Tom. 1. ad Ann. 68. Num. 3.

(*a*) Gal. 2. 7. πεπίστευμαι, &c. *Petro Concreditum eſt Evangelium præputij*

againſt that Solemn Conſent, and Agreement of the Apoſtles before mention'd, wherein it was agreed and promiſed, That *Peter* ſhould go (not to *Rome*) but to the Circumciſion, and *Paul* to the *Gentiles*. Nor can it be credible that *Peter* would Act in Contradiction to his Commiſſion, and his Agreement ſo ſolemnly made with the Apoſtles. But if at the time of that Agreement, (which was *Anno Chriſti.* 51.) he either was not, (which is moſt true) Biſhop of *Rome*, or then left it; then it evidently follows, That he Continued not Biſhop of *Rome* for Five and twenty years, as is by our Adverſaries, (with great confidence and no reaſon) aſſerted. 7. And this is further manifeſt, from our Adverſaries own Principles and Poſitions: *Baronius* tells us, *That* Peter *was* (b) *Biſhop of* Antioch *ſeven years*; *and at* Rome *five and twenty years*: And for this he Cites *Euſebius* his *Chronicon*. By the way, (concerning what *Baronius* ſays of *Peter*'s being Biſhop for ſo many years at *Antioch* and *Rome*) Obſerve, 1. That *Euſebius* ſays indeed, *that* Peter (c) *founded the Church of* Antioch; *and then, by our bleſſed Saviour's Command*, (as they ſay) *went to* Rome. But ſo far is he from ſaying that he was ſeven years Biſhop there, that he expreſly ſays, *That* Euodius was the Firſt (d) Biſhop of *Antioch*. 2. When he Cites *Euſebius* his (e) *Chronicon* to prove that *Peter* was Five and twenty years Biſhop of *Rome*, and refers us, to what *Euſebius* (f) ſays) *ad Ann. 2. Claudij.* The man (who un-

(b) *Quod ſpectat ad Eccleſiam Antiochenam, hoc Anno (Chriſti. 39.) Inſtitutam à Petro, & ſeptem Annis ab eodem adminiſtratam, &c.* Baronius Annal. Tom. 1. ad Annum Chriſti. 39. §. 9.

(c) *Petrus Eccleſiam Antiochenam fundans, inde Romam adiit.* Euſeb. in Chron. ad Ann. Claud. 1. And they ſay he went to *Rome*, *Our bleſſed Saviour Commanding him ſo to do. Cum. 7. Annos Antiochiæ ſediſſet, Poſtea Jubente Chriſto Romam venit.* Longus A Coriolano in ſummâ Concil. in Principio, in ſerie Pontificum.

(d) Τῆς Ἀντιοχέων Ἐκκλησίας, &c. *Antiochenæ Eccleſiæ Epiſcopus Primus erat Euodius.* Idem in Chronico, ad Annum Claudij 2.

(e) Baronius Ibidem; ad Ann. 39. §. 9.

(f) All that *Euſebius* ſays, is only this—— Πέτρος ὁ κορυφαῖος ἐν τῇ Ἀντιοχείᾳ πρώτην καθιδρύσατο τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν εἰς Ῥώμην ἄπιστον κηρύξειν εὐαγγέλιον. Ad Ann. Claudij. 1.

underſtood no Greek) is miſerably miſtaken; as Univerſally he is, when he meddles with Greek Authors, unleſs their Tranſlations be true) for *Euſebius* in his Greek Text, (as all know, and may ſee) has no ſuch (*g*) thing, as Five and twenty years; nay, he does not ſo much as ſay, *that he was Biſhop of* Rome *at all*; much leſs that he was Five and twenty years Biſhop there. But the Latin Copies (Interpolated and Corrupted, as thouſands others are by Roman Arts) deceived him. But to let this paſs; *Baronius* ſays, *That* Peter *was Seven years Biſhop of* Antioch, *and Five and twenty of* Rome. So that (in the whole) he was Two and thirty years Biſhop in *Syria* and *Italy*, and took upon him the Charge and Cure of the *Gentiles* in thoſe Provinces. Now our bleſſed Saviour's Paſſion and Aſcenſion was (*h*) *Anno Chriſti*. 34. to which if 32. be added (the time wherein *Peter* was Biſhop of *Antioch* or *Rome*) the product will be. *66*. So that from the Aſcenſion of our bleſſed Saviour till the year. *66*. *Peter* had taken the Epiſcopacy and particular Charge of a *Gentile-Church*; and his (*i*) Martyrdom was. 13. *Neronis*, that is, *Anno Chriſti*,68. or (as *Baronius* Computes) *69*. whence (by this their Account) it evidently follows, that during all the time from our bleſſed Saviour's Aſcenſion to his Martyrdom (about two years only excepted) *Peter* was the Apoſtle and Biſhop of a *Gentile-Church*. Which is, 1. Manifeſtly untrue, and inconſiſtent with what is ſaid of *Peter*

(*g*) The words *Baronius* Cites, as being *Euſebius* his words Ad Annum. 2. Claudij, are indeed (part of them) Ad Annum. 1. Claudij: but the reſt (*Peter's being five and twenty years Biſhop of* Rome) are neither at that, nor any other year of *Claudius*.

(*h*) Baronius Annal. Tom. 1. ad Ann. Chriſti, 34. §. 1. & 2.

(*i*) Idem. Tom. 1. ad Ann. Chriſti. 69. §. 9.

in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, with his Commiſſion, in which the care of the Circumciſion was concredited to him by our bleſſed Saviour, and with his Solemn Agreement with the Apoſtles to go to the *Circumciſion*, as *Paul* was to the *Gentiles*. And, 2. It is without any the leaſt ground in Scripture, by which, it neither does, nor can appear that ever *Peter* was at *Rome*, ſo much as for one Day, much leſs that he was Biſhop there Five and twenty years. Nor can it appear in Scripture, that ever he was at *Antioch*, ſave (*k*) once; nor is there any mention of any thing he then did there; ſave that he diſſembled, and was juſtly reprehended for it, by St. *Paul*; whereas it is evident in Scripture, that St. *Paul* was at *Antioch* for a *whole* (l) *year* at one time, conſtituted the Church there, *confirmed them* (*m*) *afterwards in the Faith*, and (*n*) *ordain'd Elders to govern them*, ſtaid there *a* (*o*) *long time*; and (*p*) *continued there preaching the Goſpel*; and yet (notwithſtanding all this) if we will believe them; *Peter* was Biſhop there, and not *Paul*. The truth is; though it be Evident that *Paul*, as Apoſtle, did all Epiſcopal Acts there; yet 'tis certain, that neither he nor *Peter*, was particularly Biſhop of that, or any other place. 3. It is utterly incredible, that *Peter* the Supream Head and Monarch of the Church (as they pretend) ſhould for Two and thirty years be Biſhop, and have the particular Charge and Cure of two of the greateſt Cities in the *Roman Empire*, and that while the Apoſtles liv'd; and

(*k*) Gal. 2. 11. 12. 13. &c.

(*l*) Act. 11. 26.

(*m*) Act. 14. 22.

(*n*) Act. 14. 23.

(*o*) Act. 14. 26. 28.

(*p*) Act. 15. 35. vid. Act. 18. 22. 23.

and yet none of them (nor he himſelf) in any of their Writings, ſhould ſay one Syllable of it, nor mention ſo much as one ſingle Epiſcopal Act done by him, in either of thoſe Cities, in thoſe two and thirty years; *no nor St.* (*p*) Luke *in the Acts of the Apoſtles*, nor St. *Paul*, who liv'd long in *Antioch*, and longer in *Rome*, and had opportunity, nay (had it been true) a neceſſity to mention it. He had need of a ſtrong Faith, who can believe this; for my part, *Credat Judæus Apella, &c.* 4. And as for *Peter's* being Seven years Biſhop of *Antioch*, and Twenty five of *Rome*; it is further Conſiderable, *That the greateſt Patrons of this Popiſh Poſition, although they agree in the Concluſion, that* Peter *was ſo long Biſhop at thoſe two places; yet they Contradict each other, and the Truth; and by their own Poſitions, (to ſave their Adverſaries that Labour) utterly Overthrow and Confute that Poſition they indeavour to prove.* This Evidently appears in this Caſe, as it is ſtated by *Onuphrius*, *Baronius* and *Bellarmine*.

(*p*) I confeſs *Baronius*, and *Hierom* (whom he Cites, Commentariorum in Epiſt. ad Gal. lib. 1. cap. 2.) tell us, That *Peter* was Biſhop of *Antioch*; and are not well pleas'd that *Luke* left it out of his Hiſtory in the Acts of the Apoſtles. Nay they ſpeak irreverently of him, and ſay, That he left that, and *many other things* out of his Hiſtory, by a Liberty or *Licence* he took to himſelf. *Hanc cum tacuit Lucas, & alia Multa Hiſtoriographi Licentiâ Prætermiſit. Primum Epiſcopum Antiochæ Petrum fuiſſe Accepimus* (ſays *Hierome* there) *quod Lucas penitùs Omiſit.* But *Hierom* (though an excellent Perſon) had his Paſſions and Errors, and in that very place, indeavours to juſtifie *Peter*, as not to be blam'd, againſt the expreſs words of St. *Paul*, Gal. 1. 11. *Luke* writ by the direction of the Holy Ghoſt, and if he writ not all that *Hierome* or *Baronius* would have him, yet they ſhould not Cenſure him. Vide Baronium ad Annum Chriſti. 39. §. 8.

1. (*q*) *Onuphrius* tells us, *That* Peter *remain'd conſtantly in* Judea, *for Nine* (r) *years next after our bleſſed Saviour's death, that is till the year of Chriſt.* 43. *after this, he was Biſhop of* Antioch *Seven years; to the year of our bleſſed Sa-*

(*q*) Onuph. Panvin. in Annotat ad Plat. in vitis Pont. ad vitam Petri.

(*r*) *Ex his* 9. *primis Annis, uſq; ad Initium An.* 2. *Imper. Claudij, Petrum Judæa nunquam exeſſiſſe, ex quo & Paulo, apertiſſimè Conſtat.* Idem. ibidem.

Saviour. 50. *And then Five and twenty years he sat Bishop of* Rome; that is, (by his own Computation) till the year of Christ, 75. So that by this Account, *Peter* was Bishop of *Rome*, *Anno Christi.* 75. And yet he there says, *That* Peter (*f*) *died, Anno Christi.* 69. And then (by his Calculation) *Peter* was Bishop of *Rome* Six years after his death.

2. *Baronius* states the Question thus. *Peter came to* Antioch *Anno Christi.* 39. *and was Bishop there* (u) *Seven years*; that is, till the year of Christ. 46. And then he says, *that from* Antioch *Peter went to* Rome, *and sate there Bishop* (x) *Five and twenty years*; that is, till the year. 71. And so (by his own account) *Peter* must be Bishop of *Rome* two years after he was dead: For the same *Baronius* tells (*y*) us, *that Peter died Anno Christi.* 69. And though this Account of *Peter's* Episcopacy at *Rome*, be not only Erroneous, but (to all Intelligent Persons) Ridiculous; yet (*z*) *Bellarmine* maintains the same Opinion, not only in Contradiction to *Onuphrius*, but to *Eusebius*, *Hierome*, *Epiphanius*, *&c.* (*a*) whose Opinions *Baronius* endeavours to confute. In short, as there is no ground in Scripture, that *Peter* ever was at *Rome*; so that he was Twenty five years Bishop there, neither Scripture nor purer Antiquity affords them any proof, or probability: *Eusebius* his *Greek Chronicon*, basely (*b*) corrupted in a *Latin Version* of it, about Four hundred

(f) *Petrus Cruci Affixus est, novissimo Neronis Anno, Christi vero* 69. Ibidem.

(t) Baronius Annal. Tom. 1. ad Ann. 39. §. 8. 9. &c.

(u) Baronius Ibidem. §. 13.

(x) Baronius Ibidem. §. 9. Ann. 39.

(y) Anno Christ. 69. Capitone & Rufo Coss. Petrus & Paulus Martyrium subiere. Annal. Tom. 1. an Annum. 69. §. 1. Neronis. 13.

(z) Vide Bellarm. de Script. Eccles. in Petro Apostolo; & Chronol. suæ Part. 2. ad Annum 39. & 44.

(a) Vide Baronium Annal. Tom. 1. ad Ann. 69. §. 2.

(b) Vide Jos. Scaligeri Animadver. in Chronol. [illegible]; Amstel. 1689.

dred years after our bleſſed Saviour, being that they muſt rely upon.

5. Our Adverſaries had ill luck, when they made *Peter* firſt Biſhop of *Rome*, attributed the Supremacy to him, and (that he might have it) made the Pope his Succeſſor. For had they choſen *Paul* in ſtead of *Peter*, they might have had far more (though not enough) to prove (and that out of expreſs Scripture) both *Paul's* Supremacy, and the Popes Succeſſion to him. For theſe following Particulars (every one of them) may evidently be proved out of Scripture. 1. That the *Romans* were (*c*) *Gentiles*. 2. That *Paul* (by our bleſſed Saviour's (*d*) Appointment) was the Apoſtle of the *Gentiles*, *Peter* was not, but of the (*e*) *Jews*. 3. *Paul* was two *whole* (*f*) *years* at *Rome*, Converted, and Eſtabliſhed a Church there; but it cannot appear by Scripture, that *Peter* was ever there. 4. The Care (πασῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν) (*g*) *of all The Churches lay upon St.* Paul; no ſuch thing in Scripture ever ſaid of *Peter*. 5. St. *Paul* made *Orders and Conſtitutions* for the good government of (*h*) *All the Churches* (without any Authority, Leave, or Commiſſion from *Peter*) no ſuch thing ever ſaid of *Peter*, either in Scripture, or primitive and pure Antiquity. 6. St. *Paul* writ a Long and Excellent Epiſtle to the *Romans*, *Peter* did no ſuch thing. Had the Holy Ghoſt in Scripture expreſly told us, 1. That our *bleſſed Saviour had Appointed*, and Commiſſion'd *Peter* to be *the Apoſtle of the Gentiles*

(*c*) Rom. 1.13.

(*d*) Act. 22. 21. Gal. 27. 8.

(*e*) Ibidem.

(*f*) Act. 28. 30. 31.

(*g*) 2. Cor. 11. 28. 1. Cor. 7. 17.

(*h*) Οὕτως ἐν πάσῃ Ἐκκλησίᾳ πάσαις διατάσσομαι (hinc διάταγμα, & διάταξις, *Edictum, Conſtitutio*) *So I ordain in all Churches.* Verſio vulg. frigidè —— *In Eccleſiis Omnibus doceo.* 1. Cor. 7. 17. vide Act. 18. 2.

Gentiles (and ſuch were the *Romans*), 2. *That he was two whole years reſiding at* Rome, *Converting and Eſtabliſhing a Church there.* 3. *That the Care and Cure of All the Churches lay upon him:* 4. *That he made Orders and Conſtitutions for the Government of All The Churches.* 5. *That he had writ an Epiſtle to the* Romans, *to Confirm them in that Faith he had preach'd amongſt them:* I ſay, had all theſe things been in Scripture expreſly ſaid of *Peter*, our Adverſaries with great noiſe and confidence would (and with far more reaſon and probability might) have aſſerted *Peter's* Supremacy, and his Roman Epiſcopacy, and that the Pope was, and is his Succeſſor. But ſeeing not one of all theſe is ſaid of *Peter*, and every one of them expreſly ſaid of *Paul*, it is Evident, that there is far more reaſon and probability (and that grounded upon expreſs Scripture) that *Paul* was Biſhop of *Rome* (and not *Peter*) and ſo the Pope might be his Succeſſor. And yet our Adverſaries (*i*) reject *Paul*, and will have *Peter* their firſt Biſhop (though ſome of them impiouſly ſay, our (*k*) *bleſſed Saviour was their firſt Biſhop*) That St.

(*i*) I confeſs *Bellarmine* would (out of *Irenæus* as he vainly thinks) perſwade us, that both *Peter* and *Paul* were Biſhops of *Rome*. *Irenæus* (ſays he) lib. 3. cap. 3. *fixit Catalogum Romanorum Epiſcoporum, & Primo Loco ponit Petrum & Paulum.* De Rom. Pontif. lib. 2. cap. 4. §. 6. Irenæus.

(*k*) *Series & Succeſſio Rom. Pontif. ſic eſt: Primus Jeſus Chriſtus.* Longus à Coriol. ſumma Concil. in Prin. in Serie Rom. Pontif. we have the very ſame words in the Edition of *Platina*, De vitis Pont. Col. Agripp. 1626. But *Platina* (baſely corrupted ſince his death) has no ſuch thing in the Old Edition, 1485. But to make our bleſſed Saviour the firſt Biſhop of *Rome*, is not only erroneous, but impious. 1. He never was at *Rome*. 2. *He was not ſent, ſave to the loſt Sheep of the Houſe of Iſrael*, (not in Perſon ſure, not to be a Biſhop of any Gentile Church). 3. There was no Chriſtian Church at *Rome* while he liv'd of which he could be Biſhop. 4. Our bleſſed Saviour remains a Prieſt for ever, and cannot have any Succeſſor. Heb. 5. 6. And therefore *Bellarm.* juſtly denies our B. Saviour to have any Succeſſor, becauſe he is *Pontifex æternus*. Bellar. de Script. Eccleſ. in T. Aquin.

Paul

Paul was not Biſhop of *Rome* (notwithſtanding all the former things ſaid of him, in Scripture) we believe and know, and willingly grant. But on the other ſide, to ſay, *that* Peter *was Biſhop of* Rome, concerning whom no ſuch things are ſaid in Scripture, either in expreſs terms, (as they are of *Paul*) or by Equivalence or any juſt Conſequence; this we ſay, is very irrational. For in things Moral or Hiſtorical (and of ſuch we are now ſpeaking) which are Incapable of Phyſical or Mathematical Demonſtration, the higheſt Prudential Motives and Probabilities will, and ought to carry the Aſſent of all wiſe men: and therefore ſeeing it is deny'd (and juſtly too) *that* Paul *was ever Biſhop of* Rome, though the Probabilities, grounded on Scripture, that he was ſo, be far greater then *Peter* can pretend to; for our Adverſaries to ſay, *that* Peter *was Biſhop of* Rome, muſt be, and is, evidently irrational. If the great probabilities we have that *Paul* was Biſhop of *Rome* deſerve not our Aſſent, certainly we cannot rationally conclude from far leſs Probabilities that *Peter* was ſo.

But when they would magnifie the Pope's Power and Supremacy, (having no better Arguments) they make uſe of ſeveral Honorary Titles given to the Biſhop of *Rome*, and his See, and of ſome Priviledges which they take (or miſtake rather) to be peculiar to the Popes, ſuch as theſe. 1. The Biſhop of *Rome* in many Stories *Object.*

and Canons, is called (*l*) *Apoſtolicus*. 2. His See is call'd *Sedes Apoſtolica*, and *Cathedra Apoſtolica*. 3. He is call'd *Succeſſor Petri*. 4. *Vicar of Chriſt*. 5. That our bleſſed Saviour gave him the *Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, &c.*

I confeſs that theſe, and many ſuch (*m*) Particulars have been urged, and (as pertinent) ſtood upon by ſeveral Popes in their Bulls, their Decretal Conſtitutions and Epiſtles, and generally by all their Party; eſpecially the Clergy (Secular and Regular) whoſe great and principal Intereſt it is, to maintain the Papal Supremacy: for if that fail, they irrecoverably fall with it. In ſome Centuries paſt, while groſs Ignorance and Tyranny, benighted and overaw'd this Weſtern Part of the World, ſuch Arguments did their Buſineſs; For few could, and (the danger being very great) few, or none, durſt Anſwer them. But after *Luther* aroſe, and Learning reviv'd, all knowing and impartial Perſons did ſee and know, that all the Arguments they did (or could) bring from ſuch Topicks, were not only Inconſequent, but indeed impertinent and ridiculous. That this may not be *gratis dictum*, I ſhall indeavour to make it Appear by plain Inſtances, (and I hope Effect it) that none of thoſe Honorary Titles or Priviledges do, or can afford any juſt ground of that Supremacy, and Papal Monarchy, they now ſo earneſtly contend for; And here

1. It is to be obſerved, that the word *Apoſtolicus*, which (for ſome Ages laſt paſt) the Pope has Aſſumed, and his Flatterers given him, as peculiar

(l) *Apoſtolicus non niſi à Cardinalibus inthronizandus.* Gratian. Diſt. 79. Part. 1. & ibidem. Can. 1. *Aliter inthronizatus non eſt Papa vel Apoſtolicus, ſed Apoſtaticus.* &, Can. ſi Papa. 6. Diſt. 4. In Lemmate. *Damnatur Apoſtolicus, ſuæ & fraternæ ſalutis negligens.*

Anſwer.

(*m*) *Bellarmine* gives us a Catalogue of fifteen ſuch Papal Titles; which are theſe —— *Papa, Pater Patrum, Chriſtianorum Pontifex, Summus Sacerdos, Princeps Sacerdotum, Vicarius Chriſti, Caput Eccleſiæ, Fundamentum Eccleſiæ, Paſtor Ovilis Domini, Pater & Doctor Omnium Fidelium, Rector Domus Dei, Cuſtos vineæ Dei, Sponſus Eccleſiæ Dei, Apoſtolicæ Sedis Præſul, Epiſcopus Univerſalis, ex quibus Omnibus & Singulis Apertè Colligitur Ejus Primatus.* De Romano Pont. lib. 2. cap. 31.

culiar to himſelf, was Anciently a Title given to all Archbiſhops. So (*n*) *Alcuinus Flaccus* tells us, *That when a Biſhop was Elected, they ſent him*, ad Apoſtolicum, *that he might Conſecrate him.* The Learned Archbiſhop (*o*) of *Paris*, tells me this; and alſo that this was the uſe of that word in the Sixth Century, in the time of *Gregorius Turonenſis*, who was made Biſhop about the Year. 572. but afterwards, That Title was (*p*) appropriated to the Pope. Now I deſire to know of our Adverſaries, how The Title, being Appropriated to the Pope, does make more for his Supremacy, then it did for the Archbiſhops, when it was common to them all?

(n) *Cum Epiſcopus Civitatis fuerit demortuus, Eligitur alius, & veniunt ad Apoſtolicum cum Electo, ut eis Conſecret Epiſcopum.* Alcuinus de Divinis Officiis. Cap. 36.

(o) Petrus de Marca de Concordiâ Sacerdotij & Imperij. Tom. 2. lib. 6. cap. 3. §. 3. pag. 67.

(p) *Sequens ætas abſtinuit — & deinceps Apoſtolici Titulus Soli Summo Pontifici attributus eſt ab Authoribus.* Idem Ibidem.

2. That *Rome* was *Sedes Apoſtolica*, and *Cathedra Apoſtolica*, we grant. Becauſe we are ſure St. *Paul* (though not as Biſhop) *ſate there.* But that *Peter* ever was there, neither we nor our Adverſaries are, or can be ſure. But it is, and (by our Adverſaries) muſt be granted too; That *Jeruſalem*, *Antioch*, and *other* (q) *Churches* (beſides *Rome*) were *Sedes Apoſtolicæ*, and *Eccleſiæ Apoſtolicæ*, and *eo Nomine*, were of great Eſteem in the *Ancient Church.* But the Biſhops of none of them then did, or could pretend to any Supremacy, much leſs to an Eccleſiaſtical Monarchy: And why *Rome* ſhould more then they, when our Adverſaries can, and will give (which as yet they never did) any Juſt and Cogent Reaſon, I ſhall

(q) The Archbiſhop of *Paris* next before cited, amonſt the Apoſtolical Churches (beſides thoſe I have named) reckons *Alexandria*, *Epheſus*, *Ancyra*, *Corinth*, *Theſſalonica*; and he might have added *Philippi*, *&c.* (De Concordiâ Sacerd. & Imperij, lib. 7. cap. 4. §. 7. Tom. 2. p. 224.) for *Tertullian* adds it, in the Place next cited.

submit. (r) *Tertullian* also reckons the *Apostolical Churches*, such as *Corinth*, *Ephesus*, *Thessalonica*, *Philippi*, *Rome*, &c. and tells us, *That Cathedræ Apostolorum, the Chairs of the Apostles were then in those Apostolical Churches; That Bishops presided in them; that if they had great Curiosity and Care of their Salvation, they should make their Addres to those Apostolical Chairs and Churches. He sends them not all to* Rome, *and* Peter's *Chair there: But* (saith he) *if thou art near* Macedonia, *thou hast* Philippi *and* Thessalonica *to go to; If in* Asia, Ephesus; *If in* Achaia, Corinth; *If thou art near* Italy, *thou hast* Rome *to Addres to.* He knew no Supremacy or Infallibility annex'd to *Peter*'s Chair at *Rome*, more then to *Paul*'s at *Corinth*, or *Philippi*. He directs them to that Apostolical Chair and Church which was next them, and Judged that sufficient, without going to *Rome*. The Bishop of *Rome* in those days, pretended to no more Supremacy or Infallibility in the Apostolical Church and Chair at *Rome*, then the Bishop of *Ephesus* or *Corinth*, in the Apostolical Chairs and Churches of those Cities. If *Sedes Apostolica*, and *Cathedra Apostolica* be a sufficient ground to infer and prove Supremacy; then either all such Churches must be Supream, (which is impossible) or none at all, which is certainly true.

3. But they say; *The Bishop of* Rome *is* Peter's *Successor, and on this they principally and generally ground his Supremacy; as derived to him,* (f) Jure Suc-

(r) *Age jam qui voles Curiositatem melius exercere in negotio salutis tuæ, percurre Ecclesias Apostolicas, apud quas Ipsæ adhuc Cathedræ Apostolorum suis locis Præsidentur; apud quas Ipsæ Authenticæ Literæ eorum recitantur, sonantes vocem, & repræsentantes faciem uniuscujusque. Proxima est Tibi Achaia, habes Corinthum: Si non longe es à Macedoniâ, habes Philippos, aut Thessalonicenses. Si potes in Asiam tendere, habes Ephesum: si autem Italiæ adjaces, habes Romam, &c.* Tertullian. de Præscript. cap. 36. pag. 338. Edit. Pamelij, 1662.

(f) *Ecclesiæ Rom. specialius in Petro, Cœli Terræque retinet habenas.* Gratian. Can. Si Papa. 6. Dist. 40.

ceſſionis, *and* (*t*) Jure Divino *too*; *by Divine Right and Succeſſion.* Now if this be true; if Succeſſion to *Peter* carry Supremacy with it, Then ſeeing they conſtantly ſay, 1. *That* Peter *was* (u) *ſeven years Biſhop of* Antioch *before he was of* Rome. 2. *And that* (*x*) Euodius *was his Succeſſor there.* I deſire to know, why the Supremacy did not deſcend to *Euodius*, his firſt and immediate Succeſſor? For admit, that *Peter* had ſuch Supremacy, and that it was not Perſonal, but to be tranſmitted to ſome Succeſſor; (both which are manifeſtly untrue) yet ſeeing ſuch Tranſmiſſion of his Supremacy, muſt be done either, 1. By ſome Act of our bleſſed Saviour. Or, 2. By ſome Act of *Peter*, tranſmitting his Supremacy to his Succeſſor at *Rome*, and not to *Euodius* at *Antioch:* it will concern our Adverſaries to ſhew ſuch Act of our bleſſed Saviour, or *Peter.* For if they can, we will ſubmit, and give the Cauſe; but if they cannot, then ſeeing, *idem eſt non eſſe & non apparere*; they muſt pardon our unbelief, if we aſſent not to that, which they cannot prove. I ſay, cannot prove; there being not one ſyllable in Scripture or Antiquity for Six hundred years, (I might give more) either expreſly affirming, or from which it may (by good Conſequence) be deduced, that either our *bleſſed Saviour* or *Peter* did tranſmit ſuch a Monarchical Supremacy and Infallibility to the Biſhop of *Rome*, more then to the Biſhop of *Antioch.* If any man think otherwiſe, let him give

(t) *Jus Succeſſionis, Fontificum Romanorum in eo fundatur, quod Petrus Sedem ſuam, Jubente Domino, Romæ Collocaverit.* Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. l. 2. c. 1. §. 1.

(u) *Eccleſia Antiocheia hoc Anno* (*Chriſti.* 39.) *à Petro Inſtituta, & 7. Annis ab eodem adminiſtrata.* Baron. ad An. Chriſt. 39. §. 9. Tom. 1. p. 269. Edit. Antverp. 1612.

(*x*) Baron. ibid. §. 18. p. 272. and in their preſent Roman Breviary, Antverp. 1660. They have a Holy-day for St. *Peter*'s Inſtallment at *Antioch*; *In Cathedrâ Sancti Petri Antiochiæ*, (ſo they call it) *In parte Breviarij Hiemali, ad diem* 22. *Februarij.* And we are there told, that that Feſtival was call'd *Cathedra Petri*; *Quia Primus Apoſtolorum Petrus hodiè Epiſcopatus Cathedram ſuſcipiſſe referatur.* Ibid. Lect. 3. p. 760. Col. 2. And for this they cite St. *Auguſtin* De Sanctis, Serm. 15. n known ſuppoſititius and ſpurius ſcrap, unworthily father'd on St. *Auguſtin.*

give us good proof of the contrary, and we will give him thanks and the Cause. 2. But admit, that the Pope succeeds *Peter*, and really sits in *Cathedrâ Petri*, as his Successor, (which is evidently untrue) yet this will not prove his Monarchical Supremacy; if it do appear that any other Apostle succeeded our blessed Saviour (before *Peter* was Bishop any where) and by his own Appointment, sat in our blessed Saviour's Place and Episcopal Chair, as his Successor; I say, if this appear, then as our blessed Saviour is far greater then *Peter*, so his Successor will be greater then the Pope, and have a fairer pretence for the Supremacy, as our blessed Saviour's immediate Successor, then the Pope can possibly have, as *Peter's*. Now for this, let our Adversaries consider, what *Epiphanius* says, Thus; (*y*) *James the Brother of our Lord was the first Bishop, when our blessed Saviour concredited and resign'd to him, before all others, his Throne or Episcopal Chair on Earth.* And here let it be consider'd, 1. That in Scripture our blessed Saviour is call'd (*z*) *a Bishop, Universal Bishop of the whole Church*; with (*a*) *Monarchical and Kingly Power.* 2. He was in a particular and peculiar way, *Bishop of the Jews*; he had Ἐπισκοπὴν, a Peculiar Oversight and Cure of them. He was sent (in Person) *only to* (*b*) *them:* He Constituted a Church amongst them, Ordain'd Apostles, and Seventy other (*c*) Inferior Ministers, whom he sent to Preach and do Miracles in Confirmation of their Doctrine;

(y) Πρῶτος οὗτος εἴληφε τὴν καθέδραν, &c. *Hic Primus Episcopalem Cathedram cæpit, cum ei Ante Cæteros Omnes, Suum ei in Terris Thronum Dominus Tradisset.* Epiphanius Adversus Hæres. lib. 3. Tom. 2. Hæres. 78. §. 7. pag. 1039. B.

(z) 1. Pet. 2. 25.

(a) Rev. 17. 14. & 19. 16.

(b) Matth. 10. 6. & 15. 24. Rom. 15. 8.

(c) Luk. 10. 1. 2.

ctrine; he conſtantly preached the Goſpel amongſt them, and did all thoſe Acts a Biſhop ſhould do in his Dioceſe. 3. And *Jeruſalem* being the Metropolis of the Jews, *Epiphanius* tells us, that it was (*on Earth*) *his Throne*, (*Thronus ſuus*) his Epiſcopal Seat, or Chair; where he uſually was, preach'd and did Miracles. 4. He ſays, *That our bleſſed Saviour choſe* James, *before all the Reſt, even before* Peter) *and concredited and reſigned to him*, Thronum ſuum, *his Epiſcopal Seat, and that* James *was Biſhop of* Jeruſalem, *is atteſted by all Antiquity.* And this probably was the Reaſon, 1. Why *Paul* (*d*) names *James* (as Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*) before *Peter.* 2. Why in the Council of the Apoſtles, *James* (and not *Peter*) gave the definitive (*e*) Sentence. So that theſe things ſeem to me certain, 1. That our bleſſed Saviour, though Biſhop of the Univerſal Church, yet he had a Particular Epiſcopal Cure, and Charge of the Jews, As his Father was King of all the World, yet Particularly of the Jews. (*f*) 1. *Sam.* 12. 12. it was (*g*) Θεοκρατία. 2. That *James* was his Succeſſor in that Cure. 3. And (if *Epiphanius* ſay true) our *bleſſed Saviour* himſelf appointed him his Succeſſor. Let our Adverſaries (by ſo good Authority) ſhew; that *Peter* was our bleſſed Saviour's Succeſſor, either at *Rome*, (as ſome of them, before mention'd, only pretend) or any where elſe; and (for my part) let them take the Cauſe. Otherwiſe, if they cannot, then we may evidently conclude, That

(*d*) Gal. 2.9.

(*e*) Act. 15.13.19.20.

(*f*) *God your King:* (ſo *Samuel* tells them) and ſo 1. Sam. 8. 7. and cap. 10. 19.

(*g*) So *Joſephus* and *Philo* call the Jewiſh Government, from *Moſes* to *Saul.* God was perſonally their King. 1. He himſelf Perſonally did give them all their Laws. 2. He Perſonally ſent his Vice-Roys, *Moſes*, *Joſhua*, and all the Judges. 3. He received, and perſonally anſwered all their laſt Appeals, which are evident Characters that he was their Supream Power, their King.

That if *James* never did, nor could pretend juſtly to a *Monarchical Supremacy* over the whole Church, though our bleſſed Saviour's Succeſſor; much leſs may the Pope for ſucceeding *Peter*. *Q. E. D.*

4. But the Pope (they ſay) is *Chriſt's Vicar*; and that he is, or ſhould be ſo, we grant. But we further ſay; that many thouſands (beſides him) are *Chriſt's Vicars* as well, and as much as he. This has been manifeſtly proved before. I ſhall only add; that the *Trent Fathers* (who, ſay they, (*h*) *were inſpired* by the Holy Ghoſt, and ſo ſurely Infallible) expreſly ſay, and Synodically define, *That our bleſſed Saviour before his Aſcention, left all Prieſts his* (i) *own Vicars, to whom, as to Preſidents and Judges, all Mortal ſins were to be Confeſs'd.* And (*k*) *Aquinas*, (and their Schoolmen) ſay; That in the Church, *the Biſhop is Chriſt's Vicar*; and they prove it well, from the expreſs and plain words of the (*l*) Apoſtle; and they might have added alſo 2. *Cor.* 5. 20. And *Henry Holden*, a Learned *Sorbon Doctor*, in his Annotations upon thoſe Texts, ſays the ſame thing. And now if to be *Chriſt's Vicar*, give any ground or pretence to Supremacy, then all Biſhops and Prieſts (who are Confeſs'd to be *Chriſt's Vicars*) may pretend to Supremacy as well as the Pope. And they being *Chriſt's Vicars* as to the Power of Abſolving and Retaining Sins, (*m*) *every poor Prieſt has as much power to abſolve the Pope, as he him.* So that any Argument drawn from this Title that

(h) *Synodus à Spiritu Sancto, qui eſt Spiritus Sapientiæ & Intellectûs Edocta declarat*, &c. Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 21. de Communione, cap. 1. And yet what it declares there is moſt evidently untrue.

(i) *Chriſtus à Terris Aſcenſurus ad Cœlos, Sacerdotes ſui Ipſius Vicarios reliquit tanquam Præſides ac Judices, ad quos Omnia Mortalia Crimina deferantur.* Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 14. *De Pœnitentiâ*, cap. 5. *De Confeſſione.* vid. Aquinat. part. 3. Quæſt. 8. Art. 6. in Corpore.

(*k*) Aquin. 2. 2. Quæſt. 88. Art. 12. *Prælatus gerit Vicem Chriſti.*

(*l*) 2. Cor. 2. 10.

(m) *Si periculum mortis immineat, approbatúſq; deſit Confeſſarius, Quilibet Sacerdos Poteſt à Quibuſcunque Cenſuris & Peccatis abſolvere.* Rituale Romanum Pauli Papæ. 5. Juſſu Editum Antverp. 1652. De Sacramento Pœnitentiæ pag. 61. & 65.

that he is *Chriſt's Vicar*, to prove the Popes Supremacy, is not only Inconſequent, but Impertinent, and indeed Ridiculous: And yet upon this ground, and another as Inſignificant, Pope *Innocent* the Fourth, in their General Council at *Lions*, Excommunicates and Depoſes the Emperor *Friderick*; *Seeing* (ſays the Pope there) *we are Chriſt's* (n) *Vicar on Earth*; *and it was in the Perſon of* Peter *ſaid to us*, *Whatſoever thou binds on Earth*, *ſhall be bound in Heaven*; *we declare and denounce the ſaid* Friderick *deprived of all his Honour and Dignity*, *abſolve his Subjects from all Oaths of Allegiance*, *and Excommunicate all who ſhew him any favour*, *or obey him as Emperor*. And to the ſame purpoſe their *Trent Catechiſm* tells us; (o) *That the Pope has* (*by Divine Right*, (*not by any Human Conſtitutions*) *that Supream Degree of Dignity and Juriſdiction*, *over the Univerſal Church*, *as* Peter's *Succeſſor*, *ſitting in his Chair*, *and as Vicar of Chriſt*.

(n) *Cum Jeſu Chriſti Vices teneamus in Terris*, *Nobiſque in Petri perſonâ dictum ſit*, *Quodcunque Ligaveris*, *&c. Memoratum Principem Omni Dignitate privatum denunciamus*, *& Sententiando privamus*; *Omnéſque ei Juramento Fidelitatis aſtrictos*, *à juramento abſolvimus*; *inhibentes ne quiſquam de Cætero ei*, *ut Imperatori pareat*; *& qui Ipſi favorem aut auxilium præſtiterint*, *ſint Ipſo facto Excommunicati*. Cap. ad Apoſtolicæ, 2. Extra de Sent. & re judicata. vid. Cap. Quanto. 3. Extra de Tranſlatione Epiſcopi.

(o) *Cum in Petri Cathedrâ Sedeat*, *ſummum in eo Dignitatis gradum*, *non ullis humanis Conſtitutionibus*, *ſed divinitùs datum agnoſcit*: *Eſtque Moderator Univerſalis Eccleſiæ*, *ut Petri Succeſſor*, *& in terris verus Chriſti Vicarius*. Ita Catechiſ. Trident. part. 2. cap. 7. de Ordinis Sacramento. §. 28. vid. etiam Bullarium Romanum, Tom. 1. pag. 347. Col. 1. §. 6. where Alexand. Papa. 6. gives all the *Weſt-Indies* to the King of *Spain*, as Vicar of Chriſt.

5. But that which they preſs with moſt Noiſe and Confidence, is, *That our bleſſed Saviour gave* Peter *the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*. They ſeem to be in Love with theſe words, *Dabo Tibi Claves*, *&c.* For in their (p) *Offices*, for only two of St. *Peter's* Feſtivals, they are repeated almoſt Twenty times. But how Im-

(q) Vid. Breviarium Romanum, in Cathedrâ S. Petri Antiochiæ. Febr. 22. & in Feſto Cathedræ S. Petri qua Romæ primum Sedet. Jan. 18. Breviarij parte Hiemali.

pertinent this is, to prove any Supremacy (much less their Papal Monarchy) will evidently appear, in that this Power of the Keys, which they would appropriate to the Pope, was given to the rest of the Apostles, as well as to *Peter* (as is proved before) nay to every Bishop and Priest in the World. For, 1. So their own *Roman Breviary*, published by the Authority of Pope *Pius* the Fifth, and afterwards revised by *Clement* the Eighth, and *Urban* the Eighth expressly says; for having told us, *that our blessed Saviour gave the Keys to* Peter: it follows; (q) *That this Power did pass to the other Apostles and Princes of the Church.* 2. Their *Trent Catechism*, having (r) spoke of the Power of the Keys; afterwards tells us, to whom our blessed Saviour gave and concredited that Power before he Ascended into Heaven; And it was *To the* (s) *Bishops and Presbyters.* So that *Catechism*, publish'd according to the Decree of the Council of *Trent*, by Pope *Pius* the Fifth. And, 3. Their *Roman Pontifical* gives the Authentick Form how they Ordain a Priest; in which the Power of the Keys is given to *every Priest*, in the very same (t) words our blessed Saviour did give it to the Apostles—(u) *Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins you remit, they are remitted; And whose sins you retain, they are retained.* 4. Lastly; The *Trent Fathers* are yet (if that be possible) more express; For speaking of the Sacrament of Pennance and Absolution, *They* (x) *declare all their Opinions to be false and*

(q) *Petro dedit Claves, transivit quidem etiam in Alios Apostolos vis potestatis illius, & in Omnes Ecclesiæ Principes.* Breviar. Rom. in Festo Cathedr. S. Petri Antioch. Febr. 22. Lect. 9. Part. Hiemali. p. 762. Edit. Antverp. 1660.

(r) Part. 1. cap. 11. §. 4.

(s) *Eam Potestatem Episcopis & Presbyteris concessit.* Ibid. §. 9.

(t) Joh. 20. 22. 23.

(u) Pontificale Romanum jussu Clement. 8. restitutum Rom. 1611. p. 52. *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum quorum remiseritis peccata, remittuntur eis; & quorum retinueritis, retenta sunt.*

(x) *Declarat Synodus, falsas esse Doctrinas Omnes, quæ ad alios quosvis præter Episcopos, & Presbyteros, Clavium Ministerium extendunt. Putantes verba illa, Quodcunque Ligaveris, &c. & quorum remiseritis peccata, remittentur, &c. ad Omnes fideles indifferenter dicta, &c.* Conc. Trid. Sess. 14. De Pœnitentiâ, cap. 6.

and erroneous, who think that the Exerciſe of the Miniſtery and Power of the Keys, belong to any, ſave The Biſhops and Presbyters; and who think thoſe words—Whatſoever you ſhall bind on Earth, &c. And whoſe ſins you remit ſhall be remitted, &c. to be ſpoken indifferently to all the Faithful; and ſo think that any of the faithful may bind and looſe, remit and retain ſins. In which words the Council does (I ſuppoſe) Infallibly Declare (at leaſt in our Adverſaries Opinion) 1. That thoſe two (*y*) Texts (which are cited in the Margent of the (*z*) Council) are to be underſtood of the Power of the Keys; though in one of them (that of *John*) the Keys be not expreſly named. 2. That the Exerciſe of that Power of the Keys belongs *To the Biſhops and Presbyters*, but to none elſe; neither to Laymen nor any Inferior Orders.

(*y*) Matth. 16. 19. & Joh. 20. 23.

(*z*) Conc. Trid. Antv. 1633. p. 152.

By the Premiſſes, I think it evident, (and conſſ'd by our Adverſaries) that every Apoſtle had he Power of the Keys, as well as *Peter*, and (ſince hey left the World) every *Biſhop and Prieſt*, as ell as the Pope. Whence it further (and maniſtly) follows; *That 'tis impoſſible that the Biſhop* Rome, *or any of his party, ſhould (as they vainly deavor) prove his Supremacy from his Power of the eys; which is common, and really poſſeſs'd by ſo ma- thouſands beſide himſelf.* For this is juſt as if *Tius* ſhould brag, that he is far richer then *Sempronius*, becauſe he has Five hundred pounds *per Annum*; when *Sempronius* has an equal Eſtate, and of he very ſame Value. Or as if *Sejus* ſhould ſay he

had far greater Power then *Cajus*, when the Power given them by the Emperor was equal and the ſame. And yet ſuch is the vanity and folly of their pretended Infallible Judges, that in their Bulls, and Papal Conſtitutions, received into the Body of their Canon Law, *Dabo Tibi Claves*, this Power of the Keys, is laid as a (Sandy and Inſignificant) Foundation, on which they build the vaſt and Inſupportable Fabrick of their Supremacy. I ſhall Inſtance only in two (though I might in many more,) 1. In that famous Decretal of *Innocent* the Third (before cited) wherein he impiouſly and ridiculouſly indeavors to prove, that the *Papal Dignity*, is as much (*a*) *greater then the Imperial*, as the *Sun is greater than the Moon:* And amongſt other wild and ridiculous Arguments to prove his equally wild and extravagant Poſition, he comes at laſt, to this, *Dabo Tibi Claves*, to the Power of the Keys, as the *moſt known* ground of his Supremacy. 2. The ſecond Inſtance, is that of Pope *Innocent* the Fourth, in his Impious Excommunication and Depoſition of the Emperor *Frederick*, (who had been before Excommunicated by his Predeceſſor *Gregory* the Ninth) in the Council of *Lions*. It is (*b*) Extant in the Canon Law, and two things there prefix'd to that moſt Impious Decretal. 1. *That he depos'd* Frederick *in the Council, for a perpetual* (c) *memory of it.* And ſo it ſtands for a perpetual memory of his Antichriſtian Pride and Impiety. 2. *That the Pope can Depoſe the* (d) *Emperor for lawful Cauſes.* And then, in that Impious Decretal, he grounds his Power to

(*a*) Vid. Cap. Solicit. 6. Extra de Major. & Obedientiâ. Where the *Lemma* or Title prefix'd to that Decretal is thus--- *Imperium non præeſt Sacerdotio, ſed ſubeſt, & ei Obedire Tenetur.* This he indeavours to prove by ſeveral ridiculous Inſtances; and then comes with *Dabo Tibi Claves, & quodcunq; Ligaveris*, as a moſt known ground of his Supremacy. *Illud tanquam Notiſſimum omittamus, quod Dominus dixit Petro & in Petro ad Succeſſores Ipſius; Quodcunque Ligaveris, erit ligatum in Cœlis, &c. Nihil excipit, qui dixit Quodcunque, &c.* And a little before he tells the Emperor of *Conſtantinople*, (to whom he writes) *Quanta eſt Inter Solem & Lunam, Tanta inter Pontifices & Reges, Differentia Cognoſcatur.*

(*b*) Cap. ad. Apoſtol. 2. De Sent. & re Judicata. In. 6.

(c) *Innocentius Sacro præſente Concilio in Memoriam Sempiternam.*

(d) *Papa Imperatorem deponere poteſt ex Cauſis Ligitimis.*

o Depoſe the Emperor principally upon the *Power of* (e) *the Keys*; which (he ſays) was given o him in *Peter*, when our bleſſed Saviour ſaid, *Whatſoever thou ſhalt bind on Earth, ſhould be bound n Heaven, &c.* ſo he, (and his Predeceſſors and Succeſſors generally for this Six hundred years laſt paſt) applies that *Power of the Keys* (which is pure-y *ſpiritual*) to carnal and temporal ends, and im-pious purpoſes. And here it ſeems to me, Conſi-derable, (and I believe will ſeem ſo, to pious and diſ-intereſſed Perſons) that in former (*f*) *Roman Breviaries* (as alſo in our *Portiforium* or (*g*) *Brevia-ry of Sarum*; and in the (*h*) *Miſſals of Salisbury* and (*i*) *Hereford*, we have this Prayer;

(e) *Cum à Chriſto Nobis in Petri Perſona dictum ſit; Quodcunque Ligaveris ſuper Terram, Ligatum erit in Cœlis, &c. Memoratum Principem, ſuis Ligatum peccatis, Omni Dignitate privatum denunciamus, ſententiamus & privamus; Omnéſque ei Juramento aſtrictos, à Juramento perpetuo abſolvimus; Inhibentes ne quiſquam ſibi de Cœtero, tanquam Imperatori pareat.*

(*f*) Vid. 1. Breviarium Romanum, by Card. *Quignonius*, approved and highly commended by *Clement* the Seventh, and *Paul* the Third, and often printed at *Paris*, An. 1536. Again, An. 1537. and at *Lions*, An. 1543. and at *Lions*, 1546. and, 1548. and again at *Lions*, 1556. and at *Antv.* 1566. and though it be the beſt Breviary *Rome* has had this Six hundred years; yet 'tis damn'd by *Pius.* 5. Bullâ Romæ dat. 7. dus Julij, 1568. 2. *Breviarium Romanum*, ex Decreto Concilii Trident. Juſſu Pij. 5. Antverp. Editum, 1568. & iterum, 1585. (*g*) Portiforium Saliſ. Lond. 1555. Part. Hiemali. in Feſto Cathedr. S. Petri, Febr. 22. (*h*) Miſſale Secundum uſum, Sarum, Pariſ. 1555. eo-dem feſto & die. (*i*) Miſſale ſecundum uſum Hereford Rothomagi, 1520. eodem Feſto & die.

1. *Deus qui Beato* Petro *Apoſtolo tuo, Collatis Clavibus Regni Cœleſtis, Animas Ligandi atque Solvendi Pontificium tradidiſti; Concede, ut Interceſſionis ejus Auxilio, &c. O God, who by giving the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven to thy Apoſtle* Peter, *haſt concredited and delivered to him the Pontifical Power of binding and looſing mens Souls, grant that by the help of his Interceſſion*, &c. Where it is evident that, (in the ſenſe and plain meaning of this Prayer and Scripture too) the *Power of the Keys is ſpiritual*, to bind mens *ſouls*, (if Impenitent)

penitent) and (if Contrite and truly Penitent) to looſe them. I ſay *ſpiritual*, for edification and ſaving mens *ſouls*, and not *temporal*, for Depoſing Kings and Emperors, and abſolving their Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance.

2. But this Doctrine was not pleaſing to the Pope and his Party; And therefore in their late (*k*) *Breviaries* and (*l*) *Miſſals*, they have left out the word *Animas*, *Souls*; and ſay only, *that God had given* Peter *Power of binding and looſing*; not mentioning in that Prayer, what it was he had Power to bind and looſe.

3. But that we may better know their meaning and reaſon why they left out the word *Souls*; it follows, a little after in thoſe late Offices—(*m*) *Tu es Paſtor ovium, Princeps Apoſtolorum; Tibi* (*n*) *tradidit Deus Omnia Regna Mundi; & Ideo Tibi traditæ ſunt Claves Regni Cælorum.* They all agree, *That the Power of binding and looſing is* (as they call it in that Prayer) *Pontificium, the Pontifical or Papal Power*; and having told us, *That God had given All the Kingdoms in the World, to* Peter *and his Succeſſors*; they add, That *Ideo, Therefore he gave him* Pontificium, *the Papal Power of binding and looſing, ſuperior to all Kingly* (*o*) *Power*; ſo that they might, by it, Depoſe Kings and Emperors, if they were not Obedient to the Pope; for ſo their Popes (as appears before) have, *in Theſi*, affirm'd, and (in their Bulls, their Publick and Authentick Conſtitutions approved, and publickly main-

(*k*) Breviarium Rom. Antv. Ann. 1660. parte Hiemali, in Feſto Cathedræ Petri Antioch. Febr. 22. p. 759. & parte æſtivâ in Feſto Cathedræ Petri Romæ, Jan. 18. Ibid. p. 693.

(*l*) Miſſal. Rom. Antv. 1619. In Feſto Cathedræ Petri Romæ, Jan. 18. p. 331. And they have the ſame again in Feſto Cathedræ Petri Antiochiæ, Febr. 22.

(*m*) Dict. Brev. Rom. Antv. 1660. in Feſto Cathedræ Petri Antiochiæ, Febr. 22. In Reſp. poſt Lect. 4. p. 760. Partis Hiemalis. And that it might not be forgotten, (being a Doctrine that makes ſo much for the Papal Intereſt) it is repeated again, in Feſto Petri & Pauli, Jan. 29. Partis æſtivæ, p. 482. & in Feſto Petri ad vincula. Ibidem p. 541.

(*n*) Though I find the word *Animas*, left out in ſome of their Older Offices; yet theſe words *Tibi Tradidit, &c.* I find in none till of late.

(*o*) The Popes Tribunal (they ſay) is *Supremus Juſtitiæ Thronus.* So *Pius* the Fifth in this his Bull, §. 3.

maintain'd that Doctrine; and (*in Praxi*) to the fatal Miſchief and Diſquieting of the Weſtern World, the ruin of many Princes, and ſcandal of Chriſtian Religion, impiouſly acted according to it, and put it in practiſe; when they had advantage and opportunity.

By the Premiſſes, I hope it may (and does) ppear, that all thoſe Honorary Titles given to he Pope, or his See, (*Apoſtolicus*, *Sedes Apoſtolica*, *Cathedra Apoſtolica*, *Peter's Succeſſor*, *Chriſt's icar*, *the Power of the Keys*, *Prince of the Apoſtles*, *c.* having been Anciently given to Thouſands beſide the Pope) who never had, nor dream'd f any Supremacy: Though in theſe late, and worſt Ages, they have been appropriated to the Biſhop of *Rome*, and (though Old and Innocent Titles) made uſe of, to amuſe and deceive he Ignorant, to cover, and give ſome Colour nd Credit to New Errors, and made Arguments to prove (what he never had) the Popes Supremacy; yet 'tis Evident, that all ſuch Arguments, drawn from ſuch Topicks, are not only inconſequent, but (as I ſaid before, and ſtill believe) Impertinent, and indeed ridiculous; and Conclude nothing, ſave that ſurely they who bring ſo bad, had no better Arguments. Two other words there are (*Papa* and *Summus Pontifex*) now appropriate to the Biſhop of *Rome*, and us generally and impertinently uſed (as the former) to Inſinuate (what they can never prove) the Popes Supremacy. For many Learned men have evidently proved (or confeſs'd) that Anciently,

ently, every Biſhop was called (*p*) *Papa*, a *Pope*, and *Summus* (*q*) *Pontifex* too. *Baronius* a moſt Zealous and Partial Aſſertor of the Popes Supremacy and Monarchy over Kings and Emperors) has, in the *Place quoted in the Margent*, confeſs'd (what without great Impudence he could not deny) that Anciently every *venerable Presbyter* was uſually call'd *Papa*, or *Pope*. *Afterwards* (he ſays) *the word* Papa *became common to all the Biſhops, though more particularly given to the Biſhop of* Rome; and he further adds, *That the name* Papa *continued common to All the Biſhops, for Eight hundred and fifty years; till* Hildebrand (*Pope* Gregory *the Seventh*) *in a Council at* Rome,) *in the Year*, 1073. *decreed, That there ſhould be but one Pope* (meaning himſelf) *in the whole World.* Here we ſee, that *Hildebrand* (that Prodigy of (*r*) Antichriſtian Pride and Tyranny) appropriates the name *Pope* to himſelf and See, which had for Eight hundred years (he might have ſaid *a thouſand*) been commonly given to Biſhops and Presbyters, as well as to the Pope. Now I deſire to know, how this, or any of the aforeſaid Honorary Titles or Priviledges, (which were common to all Biſhops, and uſually given them, for many Ages, as well as to the Biſhop of *Rome*); can be an Argument or Ground of the Popes Supremacy, which were confeſſedly no

(*p*) Vide Originem Dialogo contra Marcionitas Græco-Lat. per Rad. Weſtenium, p. 247. & Weſtenij Notas, pag. 230. 231. Pet. Delalande Concil. Antiquorum Galliæ Supplemento, p. 35. 36. 39. Baronium in Notis ad Martyrologium Rom. ad Diem, Jan. 10. c. p. 35. *Nomen Papæ tranſit in Dignitatis Nomen, ut Clerici venerandi eo nomine Appellarentur. Poſtea nomen illud cæpit eſſe peculiare Epiſcoporum, uſque enim ad Annum*, 850. *Nomen Commune fuit Omnibus Epiſcopis, inde peculiarius tribui conſuevisſet Rom. Pontifici, & ſequitur*, p. 36. *Gregorius Papa. 7. in Concilio Romæ habito*, 1073. *Statuit, ut Nomen Papæ Unicum eſſet in toto Mundo*, &c.

(*q*) Vid. Pet. de Marca de Concord. Sacerdotij & Imperij, Lib. 6. c. 13. §. 3. Tom. 2. p. 126. Col. 1. So *Ruffinus* calls *Chromatius*, *Pontificem maximum*. Vid. Ruffin. Opuſcula, Pariſ. 1580. Epiſt. ad *Chromatium*, *Pontificem maximum*, poſt p. 194. So *Clemens Romanus* (one of the beſt and Ancienteſt Popes *Rome* ever had) calls every Biſhop Ἀρχιερεύς, *Summus Sacerdos*. Clemens Rom. Epiſt. ad Corinthios, per Patr. Junium, p. 53. Edit. Oxon. 1633.

(*r*) *Plerique tum privatim tum publicè, Hildebrandum Antichriſtum prædicant, Titulo Chriſti, negotium Antichriſti agitat: in Babyloniâ in Templo Dei Sedet. Super Omne quod Colitur, extollitur, quaſi Deus ſit, ſe errare non poſſe gloriatur*, &c. Aventinus Annal. Bojorum, Lib. 5. p. 352. & Lib. 7. p. 473.

ground

ground of any ſuch Supremacy in other Biſhops, who had the very ſame Titles and Priviledges, as well, and as much as he? Suppoſe twenty Swans (*poſſibili poſito in eſſe, nil abſurdi ſequitur*) to have equal whiteneſs, and the ſame Degree of that Quality; To ſay that any one of thoſe Swans was, by far, the whiteſt Swan in the World, when as nineteen others were as white as that one: Or ſuppoſe twenty men of Equal Piety, all having the ſame Degree of Goodneſs and Vertue; to ſay, that any one of them, was, by far, the moſt Pious man in the World, when nineteen others were as Pious as he; this were certainly irrational, and ridiculous. And yet our Adverſaries reaſon no better, when they ſay; *The Pope being Chriſt's Vicar, and having the Power of the Keys, has a Monarchical Supremacy over all the Biſhops in the World*; when all thoſe Biſhops are Chriſt's Vicars, and have the Power of the Keys, as well as he. But enough (if not too much) of this. For were it not for the great noiſe, number, and confidence of our Adverſaries, ſuch miſerable inconſequent Reaſonings, might deſerve Pity and Contempt, rather than any ſerious Anſwer.

7. Having made ſome Obſervations upon the Ἐπιγραφὴ, or Title and Preamble of this Impious Bull; I come now to the Penal part of it, to obſerve what Puniſhments and Curſes are contain'd in it, and the Perſons againſt whom they are denounc'd. For although in the Title prefix'd to the Bull, 'tis call'd, *The Damnation and Excommunication of Queen* Elizabeth *only*; yet Thouſands beſides *Obſerv.* 7.

ſides the Queen, are concern'd in thoſe Curſes, (as will appear anon). Here then, it is to be Obſerved,

1. That in this Uncharitable Bull, the Pope Anathematizes and Excommunicates the Queen, as a *Slave of* (f) *Impiety*, as an (t) *Heretick, and a Favourer of Hereticks, and Cuts her off from The Unity of Chriſt's Body.*

2. He depoſes and deprives her (ſo far as the Plenitude of his Uſurped Power and Tyranny could) of *her pretended* (u) *right to the Crown of* England, *and of all, and all manner of Dominion, Dignity, and Priviledge.* By the way; what the Pope ſpeaks here (notwithſtanding his Infallibility) is neither Reaſon, nor Senſe; For if her Right to the Crown, was only (as he calls it) *Pretended*; he could not poſſibly take it away, no not by his *Plenitude of Apoſtolical Power* (if he really had it): For, 1. (Notwithſtanding all his Excommunications and Curſing) ſhe might keep that Right, and as ſtrongly pretend a Right to the Crown after, as before his Anathema's. 2. And if ſhe had only a Pretended Right, then he could not deprive her of any real Right; it being impoſſible to deprive her of a Right ſhe had not.

3. He Abſolves all her (x) *Subjects*, and *All Others*, who were bound to her by *Any Oath*, from their Oaths, and all Debt of Fidelity and Obedience, and that *For ever.* Where obſerve, 1. That 'tis not only her own Subjects he abſolves from Oaths of Allegiance; but *All Others,*

(f) *Flagitiorum Serva.* Ita §. 1. who they are who ſpeak ill of Dignities, (which the Arch-Angel would not do of the Devil) St. *Jude* tells us, in his Epiſtle, verſ. 9.

(t) *Apoſtolicæ Poteſtatis plenitudine declaramus prædictam* Elizabeth *Hæreticam, & Hæreticorum fautricem, Anathematis Sententiam incurriſſe, Eſſéque à Chriſti Corporis unitate præciſam.* §. 3.

(u) *Quin etiam ipſam Pretenſo prædicti regni jure, necnon Omni & quocunque Dominio, Dignitate, Privilegioque privatam.* §. 4. And again; *Dictam Elizabeth. Pretenſo jure Regni privamus.* §. 5.

(x) *Item proceres, Subditos, & populos dicti Regni, ac cæteros Omnes qui illi Quomodocunque juraverunt, à Juramento hujuſmodi, ac Omni prorſus Dominij, fidelitatis & Obſequij debito. Perpetuo abſolutos, prout nos Authoritate Præſentium abſolvimus.* Ibid. §. 5.

thers, who were bound to her, by *Any Oath* whatſoever. So that if any *French-man*, *Dutch*, or *Spaniard*, any *Pagan*, *Jew*, or *Turk* had ſworn to pay her Ten thouſand pounds, really (and by the Law of God and Man) due to her; he abſolves them from their Oaths; and ſo (if they had not more Honeſty and Conſcience then he) ſhe muſt looſe her Money. The Pope, in the mean time, being more kind to *Turks*, and *Pagans*, then to (a far better Chriſtian then himſelf) Queen *Elizabeth*. 2. He abſolves them from all ſuch Oaths *For ever*. So that, if the Queen had (*y*) turned Papiſt, none of her Subjects (if the Popes Abſolution had been valid) were, by an Oath, (unleſs they took a new one) bound to Obey her, as their Sovereign.

(*y*) Nay, ſuch is their Antichriſtian Tyranny and barbarous Cruelty to thoſe they call Hereticks; that when they are once actually and judicially condemn'd; though they turn good Catholicks, and repent never ſo ſincerely; and though our bleſſed Saviour Jeſus would pardon Penitents, yet Antichriſt will not. For by the Popiſh Law, ſuch Penitents are to be put into Priſon, and be immured there, and live and dye in a miſerable condition. *Si dicat Hæreticus ſe velle pœnitere, ac Hæreſes abjurare, de miſericordia poſſit recipi, ut Hæreticus pœnitens, & Perpetuo Immurari.* Nic. Eymericus, Direct. Inquiſitorum, part. 3. pag. 516. Col. 1. And *Fran. Pegne* in his Commentary upon *Eymericus* there. Comment. 46. p. 517. Col. 2. Num. 202.

4. Nor does he only Abſolve all the afore mention'd (Subjects and all others) from all Oaths made to the (*z*) Queen; but alſo ſeverely interdicts and prohibits them all, to Obey any of her Laws or Commands. That is; he forbids them to do that, to which (by the Indiſpenſable Law of God and Nature) they were abſolutely bound.

(*z*) *Præcipimus & Interdicimus Univerſis & Singulis Proceribus, Subditis, Populis & Aliis Prædictis, ne illi Ejuſve Monitis, Mandatis, & Legibus Audeam Obedire.* Ibid. §. 5.

5. And if any of the Persons mention'd in the aforesaid Particulars, did (*a*) otherwise, and obey'd any of her Laws or Commands; he pronounces the same Excommunication and Anathema against them. So that, 1. If any *French*, *Spanish*, or *Italian* Papists lived in *England* in Queen *Elizabeths* days; (after the Bull and Excommunication was publish'd, (as many did, and do, either as Merchants or Travellers) and obey'd the Laws of *England*; (as of necessity they must, and ought to conform to the Civil Laws of the Country where they live) all these, (by this wild Bull) did stand Excommunicate. Nor had they any way to Escape it, but either by Leaving the Kingdom, and all their Trade and Interest in it, to their great loss, and possibly the ruin of some: Or by staying here, and disobeying the Queens Laws, (which never was, nor would be permitted) to undergo all the Severity and Penalties of those Laws. 2. But (which is yet much more strange) suppose any *Jews*, *Turks*, or *Pagans* in *England* in the Queens time; he Excommunicates all those, if they obey the Queen; But surely this Rash and Impious Sentence, was not pronounc'd *è Cathedrâ*; for (which is no good Sign of his Infallibility) he does in this undertake a thing beyond all the Power he did or could pretend to, an absolute Impossibility. For Excommunication being a Seclusion and Depriving a man of Ecclesiastical Communion, a turning out of the Christian Church; it

(a) *Præcipimus Universis & Singulis Prædictis, ne Ejus Mandatis aut Legibus audeant Obedire. Qui secus Egerint, eos Simili Anathematis Sententiâ Innodamus.* Ibidem, §. 5.

it was abſolutely Impoſſible that either *Peter*, or the Pope his pretended Succeſſor, ſhould deprive thoſe of a Communion they never had, or turn them out of a Church in which they never were.

6. He Excommunicates all Papiſts, as well as Proteſtants, if they obey'd any of the Queens Laws or Commands. So that their Caſe was this; If they obey'd the Queen, their Sovereign, (to whom they ought a natural and ſworn Allegiance) the Pope Curſes and Damns them; and if they did not obey her, (as St. (*b*) *Paul* aſſures us) God himſelf *would Condemn them.* Certainly, all pious and conſidering Perſons will think this an eaſie choice; and that it is better *rather to Obey God then Men*, and believe St. *Paul* rather then the Pope; and yet ſuch is the Power of Error and ſtrong Deluſion, that the generality of the Papiſts, (I do not ſay all) chooſe to obey the Pope; as ſhall appear evidently anon, by their many open Rebellions, and continual Plots and Conſpiracies to diſquiet the Government, and their Indeavors (by Piſtol or Poyſon) to Aſſaſſinate and take away the Queens Life. 2. That all Papiſts who gave any Obedience to the Queens Commands or Laws, were Excommunicate, as well as Proteſtants, is evident by this: That the Popiſh Party (*c*) petion'd Pope *Gregory* the Thirteenth, *Ann.* 1580. *Elizabeth.* 13. *That he would declare, that the Bull of* Pius *the Fifth ſhould always bind the Queen, and all Hereticks, but not the*

(*b*) Rom. 13. 4.

(*c*) Their Petition was, That *Their moſt holy Lord* Gregory *the Thirteenth, would give a Declaratory Explication of* Pius *the Fifth's Bull againſt Queen* Elizabeth *and her Adherents; that it might be underſtood ſo, as always to bind her and the Hereticks, but not the Catholicks, as matters then ſtood; but hereafter, when Publick Execution of the Bull may be had.* The Anſwer was, *Theſe Graces the higheſt Biſhop hath granted to* Rob. Parſons *and* Ed. Campian (*who are now coming into* England) *the Seventeenth day of* April, 1580. *in the Preſence of Father* Oliver Manark *Aſſiſtant.* Camden in his Hiſtory of Elizabeth. ad Ann. 1580. Elizabeth. 23. pag. 217. Edit. Angl. Lond. 1635.

the Roman Catholicks, As Things then ſtood; but hereafter only, when That Bull might be put in Execution. They were willing to Obey the Pope, and Diſobey their Queen, when they had an Opportunity; They Petition the Pope to give them leave to do, what God (by Divine Law, Natural and Poſitive) had Commanded them to do; that is, to obey their Lawful Sovereign, and that they will Obey no longer, then till they have a Power and Ability, (with Security to themſelves and Eſtates) to Diſobey.

7. It is a certain Rule of Law and Juſtice, that before any Judge can Legally Condemn any; Two things are neceſſary to preceed; 1. *Cognitio* (*d*) *Cauſæ*, a Convenient Knowledge of the Cauſe; What Accuſation the Actor or Plaintiff brings; what Anſwer and Defence the *Reus*, or Defendant makes. 2. That the Proofs and Evidence be ſuch, as may be a juſt ground for a Damnatory Sentence. If either of theſe be wanting, either the Judge or Sentence, (or both) are unjuſt.

Qui aliquid Statuit, parte inaudita alterâ,
Æquum licet Statuerit, haud æquus fuit.

(*d*) The neceſſity of theſe things ariſeth from the Infirmity and Fallibility of all Human Judges; which is atteſted by Pope *Innocent* the Third, in the Canon Law; *Judicium Dei veritati, ſemper inititur, Judicium autem Eccleſiæ, nonnunquam opinionem ſequitur, quam & fallere Sæpe contingit, & falli; propter quod contingit interdum, ut Qui Ligatus eſt apud Deum, apud Eccleſiam ſit ſolutus; & qui liber eſt apud Deum, Eccleſiaſtica ſit Sententiâ innodatus.* Innocent. 3. Cap. A Nobis. 28. Extra. De Sententia Excommmunicationis. It is Pope *Innocent* the Third who ſays this; and if he was Infallible, (as the Jeſuits, Canoniſts, &c. pretend) then the Church of *Rome* does (*Sæpe*) often err in her Excommunications; and if he was not Infallible, then both he and his Succeſſors may err.

And

And hence it was that a *Pagan Judge* could truly ſay, *It is* (e) *not the manner of the* Romans *to deliver any man to Dye, before he which is Accuſed have the Accuſer face to face, and have Lycence to anſwer for himſelf.* Such was the Juſtice of Pagan *Rome.* But as Chriſtian (or, I fear, Antichriſtian) *Rome*, the Caſe is alter'd. *Pius* the Fifth, the pretended Vicar of Chriſt (our bleſſed Saviour) Anathematizes and Damns many hundred Thouſands, even Two whole Kingdoms at once, *Cauſâ indictâ* (f) *& inauditâ.* An Action ſo prodigiouſly Impious, as hath no ground or pretence for it in Nature or Scripture, or any Precedent amongſt Pagans or Chriſtians for a Thouſand years after Chriſt; till *Hildebrand*, one of the worſt in the Papal Catalogue (to the Scandal of Chriſtianity, and fatal Diſturbance of Chriſtendom) unhappily Introduc'd it, and his Succeſſors ſince, have (with like Antichriſtian Pride and Tyranny) impiouſly practis'd it.

(e) Act. 25. 16.

(f) Gen. 18. 20. 21. *The Cry of the Sins of* Sodom *was great; but before God did deſtroy them, I will go down And See, whether they have done Altogether according to the Cry of it, which is come to me; and if not, I will know. Si Judicas Cognoſce.* God gives us an example, that we ought to be ſure of the ſin, which deſerves it, before we paſs Sentence to puniſh it. But the Pope here, Curſes two Kingdoms, without any Hearing or Cognizance of the Cauſe, or poſſibility to know (notwithſtanding the Cry which might come to *Rome*) that every one whom he Curſed, deſerved it. 2. God would have ſpared *Sodom* and *Gomorrah* for ten righteous men, Gen. 18. 32. But the Pope Curſes two Kingdoms, though he neither did, nor poſſibly could know, but that there might be in them Ten thouſand pious Perſons who deſerved it not: Nay, he Excommunicates them for their Piety to God and their Prince, in Obeying the Commands of both, to which by the Law of God and the Land, they were indiſpenſably obliged.

8. Seeing it appears by this Bull of Pope *Pius* the Fifth, (as by many more ſuch, publiſhed by his (g) Predeceſſors and (h) Succeſſors) that the

Obſerv. 8.

(g) Vide Bullarium Romanum Romæ, 1638. & ibi Excommunicat. Frideric. 2. à Gregor. 9. Conſt. 13. Tom. 1. p. 89. & Excommunicat. Hen. 8. à Paul. 3. Tom. 1. p. 514. &c.

(h) *Gregory* the Thirteenth, and *Sixtus* the Fifth, renewed the Bull of *Pius* the Fifth. *Camden*'s Hiſtory of Queen *Elizabeth*, Ad Ann. 1588. p. 360. 361. Edit. Anglicanæ.

Biſhops

Biſhops of *Rome* Uſurp and Exerciſe ſuch a vaſt Extravagant Power, to Excommunicate Kings and Emperors, to Depoſe and Deprive them of all their Dominions, Honour, and Dignity; to Abſolve their Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance and Fidelity: To Inhibit and Interdict them (againſt the Laws of God and Man) to give any Obedience to their Lawful Sovereigns; and if they do, to Anathematize and Curſe them for ſo doing; and laſtly, to Excommunicate whole Kingdoms at once (*Cauſa indicta & inauditâ*) if they do their Duty, and give any Obedience to their Prince, when they forbid them, &c. I ſay for this, (and many other Reaſons) I believe the Biſhop of *Rome* has the faireſt Plea, of any in the World, to be *than Man of Sin*, and the *great Antichriſt* ſpoken of in the Goſpel. It is neither my intention or buſineſs now, fully to diſpute that Queſtion. *Whether the Pope be Antichriſt?* (many have with great ſucceſs, already, done it) I ſhall only (in ſhort) give the Reader two or three Arguments, or Motives, which (at preſent) induce me to believe that the Pope is Antichriſt; And thoſe Motives, either grounded on Scripture, the Confeſſions of our Adverſaries, the Teſtimonies of many and great men before, or the concurrent Conſent of the Reformed Churches ſince *Luther*. Here conſider,

1. That it is not only (*i*) Confeſs'd by our Adverſaries (in their Commentaries on 1. *Pet.* 5. 13. *The Church of* Babylon *ſalutes you*) but indeavour'd to be proved by many Arguments they

(*i*) See the Annotat. on 1. Pet. 5. 13. and *Tirinus* the Jeſuit ſays, (in his Commentary on the ſame Text) *Unanimiter aſſerunt Patres & Doctores Orthodoxi, Citati apud Bellarminum, Riberam, Viegam, Percriam, Alcazar. &c. per Babylonem, Romam Intelligi.* And ſo Corn. A Lapide on the ſame place: The ſame A Lapide upon Rev. 17. 16. on theſe words —— *Hi odient fornicariam, ſcilicet, Babylonem; i.e. Romam.* Vide Hen. Valeſium in Notis ad Lib. 2. Euſebij Hiſt. Cap. 15. Notarum p. 33. Col. 2. Riberam in Apocal. 14. 8. §. 25.

they bring, *That* Rome *is that* Babylon, *St.* John *ſpeaks of, in the* Revelation; *which he calls the Great Whore, Mother of Harlots, and Abominations of the Earth, and* (in more plain Terms) *The* (k) *Great City which reigns over the Kings of the Earth*; which cannot poſſibly be meant of any but *Rome*, that being then the only great City, which Reigned over the Kings of the Earth. I know that ſome of them would have (*l*) *Pagan Rome* meant: but this evidently untrue; for, 1. It muſt be *Apoſtatical Rome*; (as indeed it is) for the Apoſtle expreſly tells us; *That Antichriſt will not come, till an* (m) *Apoſtaſie and falling from the Faith come firſt:* which cannot be meant of *Pagan Rome*; it being impoſſible they ſhould fall from the Faith, who never had any. 2. It is meant of that *Babylon*, or *Rome*, which St. *John* calls *the* (n) *Great Whore, and Harlot:* but in Scripture, none but Apoſtates from the Faith, and true (*o*) Religion, are call'd ſo; none but ſhe who was once a Wife, and afterwards falls into Spiritual Whoredom; which of *Pagan Rome* neither is, nor can

(k) Rev. 17. 18.

(*l*) Pamelius Annot. ad Lib. 3. Tertul. adverſus Marcionem, num. 98. pag. 687.

(*m*) 2. Theſſ. 2. 3. vid. 1. Tim. 4. 1. Ἀποστασία ἀπὸ πίστεως, An Apoſtacy from the Faith.

(*n*) Rev. 17. 1. 5. And ſo *Hierome* calls her (alluding to this Place, *Cum in Babylone verſarer* (ſays he) *& Purpuratæ Meretricis eſſem Colonus, & Jure Quiritum viverem*, &c. in præfat. ad Didymum. Alexandrinum, de Sp. Sancto, Tom. 6. p. 217. And again, lib. 2. Adverſus Jovinianum; *Scd* (Hierom. Tom. 2. p. 379. 380. in calce Libri) *adTe loquor, qui ſcriptam in fronte blaſphemiam, Chriſti Confeſſione deliſti. Urbs Orbis Dominâ, Maledictionem, quam Tibi Salvator in Apocalypſi Comminatus eſt, potes effugere per pœnitentiam,*

e. Marian. Victorius in Notis ad dictum Librum & Locum, num. 68. ſays he means *Pagan Rome*. ut 'tis certain (which I only cite him for) that *Babylon* in the *Revelation* (in *Hierom*'s Opinion) *Rome*. Sure I am, that *Tertullian* is of the ſame judgment; (Libro adverſus Judæos, cap. 8. g. 142. num. 106.) *Sic & Babylon apud Johannem, Romanæ Urbis figuram portat, proinde & Regno cerbæ, & ſanctorum debellatricis.* And he has the ſame words again, (Lib. 3. Adverſus Marcion. p. 13. num. 98. p. 674.) where *Pamelius* in his Notes on thoſe places, 1. Would have *Pagan ome* meant. However, by *Babylon* in the *Revelation* (in *Tertullian*'s Opinion, as well as *Hieroms*) *me* is meant. 2. He would have thoſe words, (*Babylon Roma*) which were in the Margent of former Edition of *Tertullian*, blotted out; that men might not be put in mind that *Rome* was e *Myſtical Babylon, more Romano*, corrupting Records, and blotting out whatever makes againſt em. (*o*) See Hoſ. 1. 2. &c. and Hoſ. 2. 2.

be true. 3. The Actings of Antichrist are call'd (p) *Mysterium, a Mystery, things hard to be understood:* but that Pagan Idolaters should persecute and oppress Christians, and *be drunk with the Blood of the Saints*, this is no Mystery. But that all this should be done in pretence of the only True and Catholick Religion, in Honour of Christ, and by his Vicar; this is indeed a Mystery, not easily understood. So that it is evident, and confess'd, *that Rome is Babylon*, (*Mystical Babylon*) call'd so, (as she is call'd (q) *Sodom* and *Egypt*) in respect of that Analogy and Similitude between the Literal and Mystical, the Pagan and Antichristian *Babylon*, (*Babylon Chaldææ & Italiæ.*) Some of the Particulars wherein that Similitude consists, are here in the (r) Margent; and he who considers what St. *John* says of the *Mystical*, and what *Isaie* and *Jeremy* of the *Literal Babylon*, may find more. I take it then for a manifest Truth, (and confess'd by our Adversaries) *that by* Babylon *in the* Revelation, Rome *is meant, and that it is the Seat of Antichrist.* The next Query will be, *Who that great Antichrist is, whose Seat is to be at* Rome? And this will best appear by the Description and Characters of him in Scripture.

(p) 2. Thes. 2. 7. Rev. 17. 5. 7.

(q) Rev. 11. 8.

(r) The Similitude between the *Pagan Babylon*, in the Old, and the *Antichristian* in the New Testament, may appear in this; 1. They were both very great Cities. (Isai. 13. 19. Rev. 16. 19.) 2. They were both Impious and Idolatrous. (Isai. 46. 1. Rev. 9. 20.) 3. They were both Oppressors of the Church of God; the *Literal and Pagan Babylon*, of the Jews, (Jer. 50. 11.) *the Mystical Babylon of Christian Church.* (Rev. 17. 6.) 4. They both propagated their Impiety, and made other Nations to sin with them. (Jer. 51. 7. Rev. 13. 16. &c. Rev. 17. 2.) 5. In the *Pagan Babylon* God had some Saints and Servants, and they were Commanded to come out of her. (Jer. 50. 8. & 51. 6.) And so in the *Mystical Babylon.* (Rev. 18. 4.) 6. The destruction of both is denounced in the same words, of *Pagan Babylon*, (Isai. 21. 9. Jer. 51. 8.) and of *Mystical Babylon*, (Rev. 14. 8. & 18. 2.)

2. One

2. One Characteriſtical Note and Mark of Antichriſt, is given by (*f*) St. *Paul*; That he is an *Enemy*, an *Adverſary* to Chriſt (our bleſſed Saviour) ſo the word in St. *Paul* properly (*t*) ſignifies; ſo their Authentick Vulgar Latin (*u*) tranſlates it, and their Learned (*x*) Commentators prove it. So that we are agreed on this; *That Antichriſt* (*whoever he be*) *is an Adverſary to our bleſſed Saviour; and though he may pretend* (*as we know he does*) *to be Chriſt's Vicar, and Act by his Authority, and for him; yet he is really his Adverſary, and acts in Oppoſition, and Contradiction to him.* Now if this be a true Character of Antichriſt (and it is St. *Pauls*) then the Pope has a fairer Plea to be that Beaſt, then any man in the World. For under the Name and Notion of *Chriſt's Vicar*, and by a vainly pretended and uſurped Power from him, he acts contrary to Chriſt, and the expreſs Commands of the Goſpel. I ſhall (of many) give two or three Inſtances, 1. Our bleſſed Saviour, at the Inſtitution of the Euchariſt, expreſly Commands his Diſciples (and ſo all Chriſtians, who are of Age and rightly qualify'd) (*y*) *Drink Ye All of this:* And another Evangeliſt tells us, *that they obey'd, and* (z) *Did All Drink.* But the Pope, in Contradiction to this, (*a*) abſolutely forbids all (ſave the Prieſt who Conſecrates) to drink the Euchariſtical Cup; and ſo (in Contradiction to our Saviour's Command) deprives them of half that Sacrament. And this they do with a blaſphemous Impiety, forbidding

(*f*) 2 Theſſ. 2. 4. ὁ Ἀντικείμενος.

(*t*) Ἀντίκεισθαι, ἐναντίος εἶναι. Heſychius. Ἀντικείμενος, *Adverſarius.* Gloſſæ veteres in Calce Cyrilli. Etymolog. Magnum, in verbo Ἀντιάνειρα; which he renders πολεμική; and then adds; ὥσπερ Ἀντίχειρον φαμὲν τὸ ἀντίπαλον.

(*u*) Filius perditionis, qui *Adverſatur.*

(*x*) Corn. A Lapide in 2. Theſſ. 2. 4.

(*y*) Matth. 26. 27.

(z) Mark. 14. 23.

(*a*) Concilium Conſtantienſe, Seſſ. 13.

bidding all *Laicks* to have the Communion in both kinds, *Notwithſtanding the* (b) *Inſtitution of Chriſt, and notwithſtanding that in the* (c) *Primitive Church it was Received in both kinds:* and they further *declare them* (d) *Hereticks, who think otherwiſe*; and Command, *that no Prieſt ſhall adminiſter it in both kinds to any Lay-man, under pain of* (e) *Excommunication.* By the way; it is obſervable, *That it is Confeſs'd by our Adverſaries* (f) Lindanus, *Cardinal* (g) Bona, &c.) *that the whole Church of God (Lay and Clergy) for about One thouſand two hundred years, Received in both kinds, even the Church of* Rome *her ſelf:* And after that, in (h) *Aquinas* his time, it was but in *ſome* (i) *Churches*, that the Cup was deny'd to the *Laity.* The ſum is this; He who acts in Oppoſition and Contradiction to our bleſſed Saviour's Commands in the Goſpel, abrogates them, (ſo much as in him lies) calls them Hereticks, and Excommunicates thoſe who obey them, and Incourages thoſe who diſobey Chriſt, and obey him; he (I ſay) is an Adverſary to Chriſt and Antichriſt. But (by the Premiſſes) it appears, that the Pope does all this,

(b) *Licet Chriſtus poſt cœnam, Inſtituerit, & Diſcipulis ſub Utrâque Specie panis & vini adminiſtraverit: Hoc non Obſtante*, &c. Ibid.

(c) *Licet in Primitivâ Eccleſiâ hoc Sacramentum reciperetur à fidelibus ſub Utrâque Specie, tamen Conſuetudo ab Eccleſiâ introducta, pro lege habenda eſt.* Ibidem. By the way, let the Intelligent and Impartial Reader conſider, with what contradiction to truth and right reaſon the Fathers at *Conſtance*, eſtabliſh their half Communion. They reject the uninterrupted perpetual Cuſtom of the Univerſal Church, (both Greek and Latin, Eaſtern and Weſtern) for above One thouſand two hundred years, for receiving the Communion in both kinds: and yet tell us, That a late Cuſtom of the Roman Church only, and that in ſome places only (for it was not a general Cuſtom in the Roman Church to receive only in one kind, till *Ann.* 1414. the Council of *Conſtance* met and defined it) muſt be a Law to oblige all to receive only in one kind.

(d) *Pertinaciter aſſerentes oppoſitum, tanquam Hæretici arcendi ſunt & Graviter puniendi.* Ibidem.

(e) *Nullus Presbyter ſub pœnâ Excommunicationis, Communicet populum ſub utraque Specie.* Ibidem.

(f) Lindanus in Panoplia, Lib. 4. Cap. 56. pag. 342. Edit. Colon. 1575.

(g) Card. Bona de rebus Liturgicis. Lib. 2. Cap. 18. pag. 491. 492. Pariſ. 1672.

(h) *In quibuſdam Eccleſiis obſervatur, ut populo Sanguis Sumendus non detur.* Aquinas part. 3. Quæſt. 8. Art. 12. in Corpore.

(i) Which was about the year of Chriſt, 1265. Bellarmine de Script. Eccleſiaſticis, in Tho. Aquinate.

more

more ſignally in taking away the Cup in the Euchariſt then any (who pretends to be a Chriſtian) in the whole World; *Ergo*, he is Antichriſt. 2. The next Inſtance whereby it may appear, that the Pope is Ἀντικείμενος, an Adverſary to our bleſſed Saviour, and ſo has one Character of Antichriſt, is this; St. *Paul* in his Epiſtle to the (*l*) *Corinthians*, tells them, (and he ſays they are the (*m*) Commandments of Chriſt he writes) 1. *That it is the Commandment of our bleſſed Saviour, that in their Aſſemblies all things be done to* (*n*) Edification. 2. *That ſpeaking in an* unknown Tongue, *does not* (o) *Edify or* (*p*) Profit *the Church to which he ſpeaks*; (q) *becauſe they underſtand not what he ſays.* 3. *He abſolutely forbids all ſpeaking in their Aſſemblies* (*if there be none to Interpret*) *in any* (r) unknown Tongue.. Now whether the Pope be not Ἀντικείμενος, an Adverſary to Chriſt, let the Reader Judge, by that which follows. Our bleſſed Saviour expreſly Commands, that in the Aſſemblies of Chriſtians all things ſhould be in a Tongue underſtood by the People, for their Edification, (and the Apoſtle thinks it (*ſ*) madneſs to do otherwiſe) that they might know his Precepts and gracious Promiſes; and ſo their Duty, and Incouragements to do it. But the Pope (as all know) in Contradiction to this, abſolutely forbids what our bleſſed Saviour expreſly Commands; and prohibits all Publick Prayers in any Vulgar Tongue; nay, the *printing, reading*, or *having their own* (t) *Roman Miſſal*

(*l*) 1. Cor. 14.

(*m*) Ibid. verſ. 37. *The things I write unto you are the Commandments of the Lord.*

(*n*) Ibid. verſ. 26. & verſ. 12.

(*o*) Ibid. verſ. 17.

(*p*) Ibid. verſ. 6.

(*q*) Ibid. verſ. 2. 9. 14. 15. 16.

(*r*) Ibid. verſ. 28.

(*ſ*) Ibid. verſ. 23.

(t) *Cum quidam Miſſale Romanum, ad Gallicam vulgarem linguam convertere tentaverint: Nos Novitatem iſtam Eccleſiæ decoris deformatricem, deteſtamur; & Miſſale prædictum Gallico Idiomate conſcriptum, damnamus, ac Interdicimus, ſub pœnâ Excommunicationis latæ Sententiæ, Ipſo Jure incurrendæ. Mandantes, ut qui illud habuerint tradant Ordinarijs, aut Inquiſitoribus, qui ſine Morâ, Exemplaria igne comburant.* Bulla Alexand. 7. dat. Romæ, 12. Jan. 1661. Pontificatûs Ann. 6.

ſal in French (u), into which it was faithfully Tranſlated, (not by any *Hereticks*, but by good *Roman Catholicks*). This evidently appears by the Authentick Bull of Pope *Alexander* the Seventh, and ſome of his words cited in the Margent. And he there tells us, *That the Tranſlators and Publiſhers of that Miſſal, were Studiers of Novelties, to the* (x) *ruin of Souls; Contemners of the Sanctions and Practiſe of the Church*; and that they were *Sons of Perdition.* But in this, I think his Holineſs was not well adviſed. For if the Apoſtles (y) Character of Antichriſt be true, he himſelf has a better claim to that Title, and really is (what he calls them) *The Son of Perdition.* What they ſay in Anſwer to St. *Paul*, and the clear Texts againſt all praying to, or praiſing God in an unknown Tongue, is moſt Irrational, and Indeed Impertinent. It is not my Buſineſs or Intention (in this place and time) particularly to Examine it; but refer the Reader to their (z) Learned Writers for their Latin Prayers, where he may ſee what they ſay; and if he be Intelligent, and an Impartial Seeker, and Lover of Truth, he will find that St. *Paul* Condemns all Prayers to, and Praiſes of God in an unknown Tongue. Sure I am, a very Learned *Sorbon Doctor* in his (a) Notes on that place in St. *Paul* (convinc'd with the Evidence of the Text and Truth) does acknowledge it, and explains St. *Paul* as I have done. If they damn and burn their own Offices in any Vulgar Tongue, (which deſerve to be burnt for

(u) Vid. Bullam Clement. 9. Rom. 9. April, 1668. It was to be burnt by the Biſhop or Inquiſitors, even their own Miſſal in French.

(x) *Quidam Perditionis Filij in perniciem Animarum novitatibus ſtudentes, & Eccleſiaſticas Sanctiones, & praxin Contemnentes, ad eam nuper Veſaniam perveneriut, ut Miſſale Romanum in Gallicam vulgarem linguam convertere tentaverint.* So it is in the ſaid Bull.

(y) 2. Theſſ. 2. verſ. 3. 4.

(z) Vide Corn. A Lapide in 1. Cor. 14. Coſteri Enchiridion. Cap. 17. De precibus. Latine Recitandis, pag. 502. &c. Johan. Eckij Enchiridion adverſus Lutherum, pag. 392. Colon. 1565. vide Azorium Inſtit. Moral. Part. 1. lib. 8. cap. 26.

(a) Hen. Holden. Theologus Pariſienſis, in Annotat. ad 1. Cor. 14. Pariſ. 1660.

for many other better Reaſons) we may eaſily gueſs (when they have power to do it, which I pray and hope they never will) what they will do with ours. 3. But that which is the higheſt and moſt evident Inſtance, that the Pope is Ἀντικείμενος, an Adverſary and Enemy to our bleſſed Saviour Chriſt, and true Chriſtianity, is; That whereas the Goſpel was writ to be read and ſtudied (by all who had ability) as the great means of their Salvation; and accordingly was Tranſlated into all Chriſtian Languages, and all permitted to have and read it; that they might (for their direction and comfort) know the holy Precepts, and gracious Promiſes contain'd in it; and continued ſo to this Day in all Chriſtian Churches (except *Rome*) and in that too, for many hundred years after Chriſt, while Latin was their Vulgar Tongue. But when the Impiety and Tyranny of the Biſhops of *Rome* unhappily prevail'd, the Goſpel it ſelf, and the whole Book of God, was reckon'd amongſt *Damned Books, and Authors*, and not permitted to be (*b*) read in any Vulgar Tongue; no not ſo much as any *Summary* or *Hiſtorical Compendium* of it. And further, amongſt the Rules of the *Index Expurgatorius*, publiſh'd by the Command of the *Trent Council*, we are told, (with great Impiety and Blaſphemy) *That by permitting the Scripture to be commonly read in Vulgar Tongues, there comes* (c) *more Miſchief than Beneſit.* Pope *Urban* the Eighth ſays (*d*) the very ſame, (with as much

(b) *Nulla conceditur facultas Legendi vel retinendi Biblia vulgaria, aut alias Sacræ Scripturæ partes, quavis Vulgari Linguâ Editas, & Inſuper Summaria & Compendia etiam Hiſtoria Sacræ Scripturæ, quocunque vulgari Idiomate conſcripta; quod Inviolatè Obſervandum.* Vid. Obſervat. ad Regul. 4. Indicis, in Calce Concilij Trident. Antverp. 1633. & Indicem Expurg. Alexand. 7. Rom. 1667. p. 14. verbo. Biblia, & Bibliorum.

(c) *Plus inde ob hominum temeritatem, Detrimenti quam Utilitatis Oriri.* Ibid. Reg. 4. In Indice Alexand. 7. p. 4.

(d) *Librorum prohibitorum Lectio, magno ſinceræ fidei Cultoribus Detrimento eſſe noſcitur.* Urban. 8. Conſtit. 114. Bullarij Rom. Tom. 4. §. 1. p. 119. Edit. Rom. An. 1638.

much Impiety as his Predeceſſors) and further adds; *That all who have any prohibited Books*, (of which number it is Evident the Bible in any Vulgar Language is one) *they muſt bring them to the Biſhop or Inquiſitor, and they muſt Burn them preſently, by the hand of the Hangman, or ſome ſuch Officer*; (for I ſuppoſe they are not to do it themſelves). And we have a late and further Inſtance of this Antichriſti in Impiety, in a Bull of Pope *Clement* the Ninth. The New Teſtament (as appears by the Bull) was Tranſlated into *French*, and Printed at *Lions*; The Pope (*Animus meminiſſe horret*) (e) *Damns* and prohibits it, under the very Name, *The New Teſtament of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*; and Excommunicates all, of what dignity ſoever, who ſhall print, ſell, read, or have it; and Commands (under pain of Excommunication) that they who have it, bring it to the *Ordinary or* (f) *Inquiſitors*; and what they muſt do, with it, the Bull of *Urban* the Eighth, (but now Cited) will tell you; they muſt *burn it*, and (as a damned Book) aboliſh it. So *Clement* the Ninth Commands the (g) *Roman Ritual* in *French*, to be burnt. But that which makes their Error and Impiety more evident, is; That even then and there, where they abſolutely prohibit the Goſpel in any Vulgar Tongue, and Damn it to the Fire, *they permit the* (h) *the Turkiſh Alcaron* in a Vulgar Tongue, with leave had from the Inquiſitors, who yet could give no leave to any (as appears before by the Rules of their Ex-

(e) *Liber Verſionis Gallicæ Novi Teſtamenti, cui Titulus eſt —— Le Nouveau Teſtement de noſtre Seigneur Jeſus Chriſt, &c. Nos Librum hujuſmodi tanquam temerarium, Damnoſum, à vulgatâ Editione deformem Damnamus, & prohibemus: ita ut nemo cujuſcunque Conditionis ſub pœna Excommunicationis, illum legere aut retinere audeat, ſed Ordinariis aut Inquiſitoribus deferat.* &c. Ita Clem. 9. Bulla data Rom. 29. Apr. An. 1668.

(f) *Ii qui Libros prohibitos habuerint, & eos ad Epiſcopum aut Inquiſitores deferant, qui eos quantocyus Comburere debeant.* Ibid. §. 3.

(g) In his Bull, 9. Apr. 1668. Pontificatus ſui Ann. 1. *Damnamus — mandantes, ut quicunque librum illum Ritualem habuerint vel habebunt, locorum Ordinariis, vel Inquiſitoribus ſtatim tradant, qui nullâ interpoſitâ mora, igni comburant, aut comburi faciant, &c.*

(h) *Item Alboranus Mahometis in Linguâ Vulgari, ex Conceſſione Inquiſitorum haberi poſſit.* Index Librorum prohibitorum. Alexandr. 7. Edit. Rom. 1664. pag. 3.

Expurgatory (*i*) Index) to have the Goſpel, or any part of it, in any Vulgar Tongue. Prodigious Impiety! The *Turkiſh Alcoran* (the contrivance of a Monſtrous Impoſtor, and Enemy to Chriſt and Chriſtianity) is permitted; and the Goſpel of our bleſſed Saviour is *abſolutely prohibited and damn'd.* And though in doing this, they Act very Impiouſly, yet (in their Generation and Circumſtances) very wiſely. For neither the *Alcoran*, nor any Book in the World, is ſo fatal to their miſcall'd Catholick Religion, as (when truly underſtood and believ'd) the Bible. That Book evidently diſcovers, and condemns their Errors; and therefore they are concern'd to keep it from the People, leaſt they ſhould find (as by that Divine Light they eaſily might) and forſake their Errors. The Premiſſes conſider'd, let the Reader judge, Whether the Pope have not this Mark of the *Beaſt*, and Character of *Antichriſt*, that he is, ὁ Ἀντικείμενος, the *Adverſary* of Chriſt, and that Religion Eſtabliſh'd by him; who prohibits the having and reading (and ſo the Underſtanding) of the Goſpel, Damns it to the Fire, and burns it; and yet at the ſame time permits the *Alcaron.*

(i) *Biblia quocunque Idiomate Vulgari conſcripta.* Ita Index Librorum prohibitorum, Alexand. 7. Juſſu Editus Romæ, 1667. verbo Biblia, p. 14.

3. Another Characteriſtical Note or Mark of *Antichriſt* given by St. *Paul*, is; *That he Exalts himſelf above all that is called God or Worſhipped*; So our Engliſh Tranſlation; ſo their Authentick Vulgar (*k*) Latin; and their own Learned (*l*) Commentators juſtifie it. The

(k) *Extollitur ſuper Omne quod dicitur Deus, aut quod Colitur.* Clem. 8. in Bibliis, 1592.

(*l*) Corn. A Lapide in 2. Theſſ. 4. §. 27.

word in the Text properly (*m*) signifying, *Id quod Colitur*, any thing or Person, which is the Object of Honour and Veneration. So that thus far we are agreed, *That Antichrist will Exalt himself above all that is called God*, (as all Magistrates Subordinate and Supream, Kings and Emperors in Scripture are) *or worshipped.* This then (*in Thesi*) being granted; we must next (*in Hypothesi*) Inquire, *Whether this Characteristical Note and Mark of Antichrist, may be truly affirm'd of the Pope, and be really found in him?* In Answer to which Query, I say; I hope it may, and does appear by the Premisses, That the Pope does Exalt himself, far above all Kings and Emperors, more then any man in the World ever did, or (Antichrist excepted) ever will; and therefore I shall only add two or three things in Confirmation of the Premisses.

1. Then, his Favourers and Flatterers give him (and he approves and assumes it) *The* (n) *Title of Emperor of the Universe.* Upon this account; That the *Pope is Emperor of the Universe*, of the whole World; it follows, That all Kings and Emperors are his Subjects, and he their Supream Lord and Sovereign, and so, far greater in Power, then any one, or all of them together. And least we should mistake, and undervalue his Papal Greatness; Pope *Innocent* the Third told the Emperor of *Constantinople*, (and has told us in the Body of their approved and received Law) *That the Pope is as much greater then the Emperor, as the* (o) *Sun is greater then the Moon.*

(m) Σέβω, σεβάζω, Colo, veneror. Σέβας, Τιμὴ, (Suidæ & Hesychio) Σέβασμα, Colendum, venerandum, Id quod veneratur. Athanasius Orat. Contra Gentes, (ex sapientiâ Sirach, c. 14. 17.) Τὸν πρὸ ὀλίγω τιμαδίντα ἄνθρωπον, τοῦτο σέβασμα ἐλογίζοντο· ubi σέβασμα Numen, Deum significat. Sic Act. 17. 23. Σεβάσματα Sacra Gentilia, quæ venerabantur, seu Numina, Altaria, Templa, &c. Hinc Cæsares Σεβαστοὶ, Augusti; Hesychio, πρεσβυτοὶ, Τιμιοί.

(n) *Sanctiss. Urban. 8. Universi Imperator. Angelus* Maria Cherubinus, in Calce. Tom. 4. Bullarij Romani, Rom. 1638. pag. 120.

(o) Vid. Cap. Solicit 6. Extra. De Major. & Obed. *Quanta est inter Solem & Lunam, tanta inter Pontifices & Reges differentia cognoscatur.*

Moon. And here the Author of the Gloſs, (*Bernardus de Botono*, a great Lawyer, but no good Aſtronmer) tells us, *That the Sun is* 47. *times greater then the Moon*; *and ſo* (by that Computation) *the Pope is* 47. *times greater then the Emperor.* This is pretty well, and gives ſo vaſt a Magnitude to the Pope above the Emperor, that a man would think it might ſatisfie his Ambition, ſo that he needed not ask, nor his greateſt Flatterers give him more. Yet they do give much more. For in a Marginal Note on the ſaid Chapter, (in their moſt (*p*) Correct Editions of their Law) we are told, *That the Sun is greater then the Moon,* Quinquagies Septies, 57. *times*; *and ſo the Pope ſo much greater then the Emperor.* But this is not all. *Laurentius* (a Canoniſt) in the *ſame* (q) *place*, tells us; *That it is evident, that the Sun is* 7744½. *greater then the Moon*; *and ſo the Pope* (*omitting the Fraction*) *Seaven thouſand, ſeaven hundred, and forty four times greater then the Emperor.* This is ſo prodigiouſly erroneous and impious, as none, ſave their moſt Holy and Infallible Guide, could be guilty of ſuch Error and Impiety. But a Learned *Roman* (*r*) *Catholick* (who underſtood Aſtronomy, and the Magnitude of the Sun, (much better then the Pope, or his Paraſites) ſeriouſly tells us, *that the Sun is greater then the Moon.* 6539. *times.* And ſo by the Popes Logick and Decretal Definition, and the Computation of his beſt Artiſts, he muſt be. 6539. times greater then the Emperor. Monſtrous

(*p*) Vid. Corpus Juris Canon. cum Gloſſis. Pariſ. 1612.

(q) *Palam eſt, quod magnitudo Solis continet magnitudinem Lunæ* 7744½. Vide Addit. ad Gloſſ. verb. Inter Solem. Ad dictum cap. 6.

(*r*) Clavius Comment. in Johan. de Sacro Boſco. p. 189.

Pride and Ignorance! which is so far from proving him to be our blessed Saviours Vicar, that it evidently proves him, to be that (*f*) *Man of Sin*, the great Antichrist, who exalts himself (ὑπὲρ πάντα λεγόμενον Θεόν) above all Kings and Emperors. Certainly Antichrist cannot exalt himself more, then to declare to the World, (as the Pope here does) in his Publick Laws and Constitutions, that he is 6539. times greater then any King or Emperor. So that although St. (*t*) *Paul*, and (*u*) *Peter* too, acknowledged the *Emperors Power Supream*, and required that all men (even the Pope if he were a man) should conscienciously obey them; though St. *Paul* (*x*) *appeal* (not to *Peter*, but) to *Cæsar*, as Supream: Though *Athanasius* say, *That there lay no* (*y*) *Appeal from the Emperor, but to God*; and though (*z*) *Tertullian* say, *That the Emperor was, Solo Deo minor*; and the Bishops of *Rome*, for almost One thousand years after our blessed Saviour, acknowledged the Emperors their Soveraign Lords, yet *Hildebrand* and his Successors, have (as above) *exalted themselves far above all that is call'd God*, and have that indelible Character of Antichrist. *Q. E. D.* 2. And they further say, *That this Universal Monarchy is given him by God himself*; and so he has it, (not by any Human Right or Injust Usurpation, but *Jure Divino*) by the Law of God, and a Right derived from him; and this is said, not once only, nor by any private (*a*) Person, (whose Authority might be question'd) but many

(*f*) 2 Thess. 2. 4.

(*t*) Rom. 13. 1.
(*u*) 1. Pet. 2. 13.

(*x*) Act. 25. 11.

(*y*) Athanasius in Apologia, ad Constantium Tom. 1. p. 680. D.
(*z*) Tertull. ad Scap. cap. 2. & Apolog. c. 30.

(a) *Tu es Pastor Ovium, Princeps Apostolorum; Tibi Tradidit Deus Omnia Regna Mundi:* Breviar. Roman. Antv. 1660. part. Hiemali, in Festo Cathedræ S. Petri Antiochiæ, in Resp. post Lect. 4. p. 760.

many times in their Authentick *Roman* (*b*) *Breviary*, reſtored according to the (*c*) *Decree of the Council of Trent*, and reviſed and publiſh'd by the Authority and Command of (*d*) three Popes ſucceſſively; ſo that we may be ſure they approve it. That *Breviary* has it thus, (ſpeaking of *Peter*)—*Thou art Prince of the Apoſtles; And God hath Given Thee All the Kingdoms of the World.* Theſe are the words of that *Authentick Breviary*, approved and confirm'd by the Authority of thoſe three Popes before mentioned, (as appears by their Bull prefix'd to the Edition) and is now in publick uſe in their Church. So that he Exalts himſelf, as Univerſal Monarch, over all the Kings and Kingdoms in the World; and that (as he impiouſly pretends) by a Divine Right, and the Donation of God himſelf; And hence it is, *That not only the Canoniſts* (the conſtant and great Paraſites of the Pope) *but even the Learned Divines of the Roman Church, give the Pope* (and he Approves and Aſſumes) *ſuch Extravagant and Blaſphemous Titles, as none but the Man of Sin, who Exalts himſelf above all that is called God, would approve.* To paſs by many hundreds of the like nature, I ſhall Inſtance only in one. *Stapleton* (an Engliſh man, and a very Learned Profeſſor of Divinity at *Doway*, in his Dedicatory Epiſtle to Pope *Gregory* the Thirteenth, calls that Pope (*e*)—*The Higheſt Top and Prince of the Catholick Church, The Maſter of the whole World, and on Earth The Supream God or Deity.* Certainly, he who approves

(*b*) Ibid. parte Hiemali in Feſto Cathedræ Sti. Petri Romæ, ad diem Jan. 18. p. 700. Col. 1. & in dicti Breviarij Part. Æſtiva, p. 482. In Feſto Petri & Pauli, Jun. 29. & ibidem rurſus p. 541. In Feſto S. Petri ad vincula.

(*c*) The ἐπιγραφὴ or Title of that Breviary, is thus —— *Breviarium Romanum, ex Decreto Sacro-Sancti Concilij Tridentini reſtitutum, Tij. 5. Pont. Max. Juſſu Editum, & Clement. 8. primum, nunc demum Urbani P. 8. Authoritate recognitum.* Antv. 1660.

(*d*) Pius. 5. Clem. 8. Urban. 8. as above.

(*e*) Stapleton, in Academiâ Duacenâ Theol. Profeſſor, in Epiſt. Greg. 13. Princip. Fidei Doctrin. Demonſtrationi præfixa; Papam appellat, *Catholicæ Eccleſiæ Verticem Coruphæotatum, Totius Orbis Magiſtrum & Supremum in terris Numen.*

proves and admits ſuch Titles to be given him, *Exalts himſelf above all that is called God*, and ſo has the Character of Antichriſt mention'd by the Apoſtle, 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 4. And here (though I intended it not) I ſhall crave leave to add two or three Paſſages more, which caſually come in my way and memory, and are very pertinent to our preſent purpoſe. 1. The Gloſs on their (*f*) Canon Law tells us, *That the Pope is neither God nor Man, but ſomething more then Man.* And though this Impious and Blaſphemous Gloſs was (*g*) Cenſured to be left out, by the Maſter of the *Sacred Pallace.* Yet (*h*) *Clement* the Eighth thought otherwiſe; and thoſe words are ſtill in the beſt Edition of the (*i*) Canon Law; only with this Note in the Margent, *Hæc verba ſunt ſano modo intelligenda, prolata enim ſunt, ad Oſtendendum Ampliſſimam Pontificis Rom. Poteſtatem.* But this Gloſs is ſomething modeſt, though it make the *Pope more then Man*; and being in Verſe, may have ſome Poetical Licence allow'd. 2. But another Gloſs in plain Proſe expreſly ſays, *That it is* (k) *our Lord God the Pope.* For although in ſome (*l*) Old Editions of the Canon Law, it was only *Our Lord the Pope*; yet now in the moſt (*m*) Correct Editions of that Law, confirmed by *Gregory* the Thirteenth, it is (without any Qualification in the Margent) *our Lord God the Pope.* 3. And to make the Blaſphemy full, and evidently Antichriſtian, *Ant. Puccius* in an Oration made by him in their General *Lateran Council*, ſpeaking to Pope

(f) *Nec Deus es, nec Homo, quaſi neuter es, inter utrúmque.* Gloſſa ad Procœmium Clement. verbo, *Papa.*

(*g*) Vide Cenſuram in Gloſſas Jur. Can. per Tho. Manrique, Colon. 1572. p. 13. 14.

(*h*) Vide Indicem Expurgat. Olyſipone, 1624. p. 350.

(*i*) Pariſ. 1612.

(k) *Credere Dominum Deum noſtrum Papam non poſſe ſic ſtatuere, Hæreticum Cenſetur.* Gloſſa ad Cap. cum inter. 4. verbo. Declaramus. De verborum ſignific. Extravag. Johan. 22.

(*l*) Edit. Pariſ. 1519.

(*m*) Edit. Pariſ. 1612.

Pope *Leo* the Tenth, ſays, (*n*) *That the Rayes of His Divine Majeſty did dazle his Eyes.* Impious and Antichriſtian Pride and Blaſphemy! yet approved at *Rome*, and by themſelves (to their ſhame) publiſhed to the World. Nor is this all: He pretends to, and aſſumes an Infallibility, and that of ſo high a Nature, that all his Definitions and Determinations of Doubts (whether *è Cathedrâ* or *not*; *whether in a General Council, or out of it*; *to be the Word of God.* So a Learned Popiſh (*o*) Author tells us; *That the Word of God is threefold*; 1. *His written Word, the Scriptures*: 2. *His unwritten Word, Traditions*: 3. *His explained or declared Word*; *when Scripture or Traditions are declared and explained by the Pope*; *whether in or out of a Council.* And he ſays, (*p*) *That this Laſt word of God,* (the Popes Definitions and Explications) *is the moſt approved, and moſt men do with greater pleaſure acquieſce in it.* Though this be much, yet not all. For the Pope does not only pretend to, and aſſume to himſelf an Univerſal Monarchy, over all the Kingdoms of the World; but ſuch an Abſolute Power to diſpoſe of them; that he can (*parte inconſultâ*) give away Kingdoms (*pro Arbitrio*) to whom he pleaſes. A Memorable, and (for Papal Pride and Injuſtice) a Prodigious Inſtance we have of this, in Pope *Alexander* the Sixth, who at one Clap, gave to (*q*) *Ferdinand*

(n) *Divinæ Majeſtatis tuæ Conſpectus, rutilanti cujus fulgore oculi mei Caligant, &c.* Crab. Concil. Tom. 3. Conc. Lateran. Seſſ. 9. p. 648. Col. 2.

(o) *Verbum Dei eſt triplex*: 1. *Scriptum, ſcilicet Scriptura ſacra.* 2. *Non ſcriptum, Traditio.* 3. *Explicatum; Cum dubia in verbo ſcripto vel non ſcripto Explicantur, & determinantur: & hoc ſit præſertim per ſummum Pontificem, ſive Extra Concilium, ſeu in Concilio.* Lud. Bail. in Apparatu de triplici verbo Dei, Tom. 1. Summæ Concil. Præfixo.

(p) *Iſte Modus ultimus* (the Popes determinations of doubts) *Magis Probatus eſt, & cum majore ſuavitate ei Plures acquieſcunt.* Ibidem in principio dicti Apparatus.

(q) *De noſtra mera Liberalitate, Omnes Inſulas & Terras firmas inventas & Inveniendas, verſus Occidentem & Meridiem, fabricando unam Lineam à Polo Arctico ad Antarcticum, quæ Linea diſtet à qualibet Inſularum quæ Vulgariter dictæ ſunt, De los Azores y Cabo Vierde, Centum Leucis verſus occidentem, Cum Omnibus illarum dominijs, Civitatibus, Caſtris, Villis, Juribus, & Pertinentiis Univerſis, vobis, hæredibus & ſucceſſoribus in perpetuum donamus.* Conſtit. 2. Alexand. 6. §. 8. in Bullario Rom. Tom. 1. p. 347.

and

and *Elizabeth*, (King and Queen of *Caſtile*) and their Heirs for ever, *All the* Weſt-Indies, *from Pole to Pole, and all the Iſles about them* (*which lay One hundred Leagues Weſtward from* Cape Verd, *and the* Azores) *with all their Dominions, Cities, Caſtles, Villages, all the Rights and Juriſdictions belonging to them.* And this, he ſays, he gives, *of his own meer Liberality*, by Power deriv'd *from Peter*, and *as Vicar of Chriſt.* Then he *Excommunicates all of what degree ſoever, Kings and* (r) *Emperors* (*by name*) *who ſhall dare to trade into the* Weſt-Indies (*given to* Ferdinand *by him*) *without the leave and licence of the ſaid* Ferdinand. Here we ſee, the Pope gives away almoſt half the World, from the true Owners, *Cauſa incognita, inaudita, indicta*; the Perſons and their Quality being utterly unknown to him. If it be ſaid, *They were Pagan Idolaters:* Grant that. Yet, 1. What they all were, he neither did, nor could know. 2. If they really were ſuch, (as probably they were) yet *dominium non fundatur in gratiâ*; a Pagan and Idolater may (*jure naturæ*) have as juſt a Temporal Right to his Eſtate, as a Chriſtian. *Cæſar* was a *Pagan* in our bleſſed Saviours time; and yet he Commands them to (*ſ*) *give to Cæſar the things which were Cæſars.* Some things were *Cæſars* in which he had a propriety, and to which he had a right, and his Subjects an Obligation to pay him tribute, and other things (*t*) due to him. But I hope this will not be deny'd: For if none, but pious men, and true Chri-

(r) *Ac Perſonis cujuſcunque Dignitatis, etiam Imperialis, Regalis, &c. ſub Excommunicationis latæ Sententiæ pœnâ, diſtrictius Inhibemus, ne ad Inſulas aut terras dictas, pro mercibus habendis, vel cauſa aliâ quavis, accedere præſumant, abſque veniâ veſtrâ, aut Hæredum Specialî Licentiâ.* Ibid. §. 8.

(*ſ*) Matth. 22. 21.

(*t*) Rom. 13. 7. The Apoſtle commands the Romans to pay tribute to whom it was due, that is, to *Cæſar*; for to him only they were Subjects, and to him only Tribute was due from them. Our bleſſed Saviour (as man, born in the Roman Empire) was ſubject to *Cæſar*, and paid him Tribute. Matth. 17. 25. And that (as *Cajetan* and *Lucas Burgenſis* on that place, truly ſay; That he paid that Tribute, not *de facto* only, but *de debito.*

Chriſtians have any juſt Right to what they poſſeſs, it will (I fear) go hard with his Holyneſs, and he will have no Propriety in St. *Peters* Patrimony, or any other thing he does poſſeſs. And therefore (if he Impartially conſider it) he may find ſome reaſon, if not for Truths ſake (which with him is not always a prevailing Motive) yet for his own, to be (in this) of my opinion: By the Premiſſes, I hope it may, and does appear, *That the Pope Exalts himſelf above all that is called God, or worſhipped*; and ſo really has the Characteriſtical Note and Mark of the Beaſt, that *Man of Sin*, and is indeed that *great Antichriſt* deſcribed and foretold in Scripture.

4. Nor am I ſingular in this Opinion; many Excellent Perſons (both for Learning and Piety) have ſaid as much: and ſome have given us a Catalogue of their (*u*) *Teſtimonies*. I ſhall ſay nothing of the Fathers; many of which make *Rome Babylon* in the *Revelation*, ſome of them I have Cited before, and *Schardius* (in the Place laſt Quoted) has more. Nor ſhall I ſay any thing of the poor perſecuted *Waldenſes* and *Wicliſiſts*, or the Reformed Churches ſince *Luther*; who both believ'd and conſtantly affirm'd and prov'd the Pope to be Antichriſt; eſpecially the Church of *England*, as appears, both by her ableſt Writers, and her *Authentick* (*x*) *Homilies*, confirmed by the Kings Supream Authority in Convocations and Parliaments. Omitting all theſe (which yet were abundantly ſuf-

(*u*) Vide *Teſtimonia ex variis Authoribus Collecta Romam Babylona eſſe, Ejúſque Epiſcopum jure Amichriſtum dici*; per Simon. Schardium, in calce Epiſtolarum Petri de Vincis. Baſil. 1566.

(*x*) See the third part of the Homily of Good Works; in the firſt part of the Homilies, p. 38. and the ſixth part of the Homily againſt Rebellion, in the ſecond part of the Homilies, p. 316. where the Pope is call'd the *Babylonical Beaſt of Rome*.

ſufficient to ſhew, that I am not ſingular in this Opinion) I ſhall only (of very many more) give a few Evident Inſtances and Teſtimonies of thoſe who lived and died in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*. And here

1. The Emperor *Frederick* the Second, in a Letter to the King of *France*, complaining of the Prodigious Pride and Tyranny of the Pope, and his Impious Practices to divide the Empire, and ruin him; he ſays, *That he Indeavour'd to build the* (y) *Tower of Babylon againſt him.* And that we may know what and whom he meant by *Babylon*, in another Epiſtle to the King and Nobility of *France*; he Complains of the horrid Injuries and Injuſtice done him by the Pope and his Party; he calls them (z) *the Elders of Babylon, &c.*

(y) *Noviſſime ad Supplantationem noſtram aſſurgens, et adverſus Deum Conſtrueret Babylonis, &c.* Apud Pet. de. de Vineis, Epiſt. Lib. 1. cap. 13. pag. 129.

(z) *Videte Orbis generale Scandalum, diſſidia gentium, generale juſtitiæ dolcatis Excidium, exeunte Nequitia A Senioribus Babylonis, qui populum hactenus Regere videbantur, &c.* Apud eundem, lib. 1. cap. 21. pag. 152.

2. A faithful Hiſtorian (ſpeaking of Pope *Hildebrand*, or *Gregory* the Seaventh, and his Prodigious Tyranny and Impiety) tells us, (*a*) *That in thoſe times, Moſt Men, both Privately and Publickly, curs'd* Hildebrand, *call'd him Antichriſt: that under the Name and Title of Chriſt, he did the work of Antichriſt; that he ſat in* Babylon, *in the Temple of God; and* (*as if he had been a God*) *Exalted himſelf above all that is worſhipped, &c.* And much more to the ſame purpoſe; abundantly Teſtify'd by the Hiſtorians of thoſe times, who were neither *Lutherans*, nor (by the *Re-*

(a) *Plerique tum priuatim, tum Publicè indignum facinus clamitant, Pro Concione Gregorio Maledicunt, Hildebrando male precantur; ipſum Antichriſtum eſſe prædicant, Titulo Chriſti, negotium Antichriſti agitat; in Babylonia, in Templo Dei Sedet; ſuper Omne id quod colitur, extollitur; quaſi Deus ſit, &c.* Joh. Aventinus Annal. Bojor. lib. 5. p. 352. Baſil. 1615. vide plura Ibid. p. 363.

Roman Church) then reputed *Hereticks*. And afterward (speaking of the same *Hildebrand*) we are told—(*b*) *That he laid the Foundation of the Kingdom of Antichrist One hundred and seaventy years before that time* (*when that was said*) *under a colour and shew of Religion; He begun the War with the Emperor, which his Successors continued to that Day,* (till the time of *Friderick* the Second, and Pope *Gregory* the Ninth) where we have many things more, concerning the Prodigious Pride, Impiety, and Tyranny of the Pope, to prove that he was Antichrist. The same Historian also tells us; *That almost All Good, Just, and* (c) *Honest Men did in their Writings publish to the World, that the Empire of Antichrist begun about that time,* (the time of *Hildebrand* he means) *because they Saw those things then come to pass, which were foretold long before.*

(b) *Hildebrandus ante Annos.* 170. *primus specie Religionis Antichristi Imperij fundamenta jecit. Hoc bellum nefandum primus auspicatus est, quod per Successores huc usque continuatur--- Flamines illi* (Papas Rom. Intelligit) *Babyloniæ Soli regnare cupiunt: ferre parem non possunt, in Templo Dei Sedeant, Extollantur supra omne id quod Colitur: Ingentia loquitur perditus homo ille, quasi Deus esset, &c.* Aventine Ibid. lib. 7. pag. 420. 421. Vide plura ibidem pag. 444.

(c) *Plerique Omnes Boni, justi, ingenui, simplices, tum Imperium Antichristi cœpisse, quod ea quæ Christus tot Annos Ante nobis Cantavit, evenisse cernebant, memoriæ Literarum prodidere.* Joh. Aventinus, Ibidem, lib. 5. pag. 363. Edit. 1615. & Edit. 1580. pag. 470. And the Learned Marcus Ephesius in the Council of *Florence*, call'd *Rome Babylon*. Binius Concil. Tom. 8. pag. 980. Edit. Paris. 1636.

3. But this is not all. We have further Testimonies of this Truth. 1. *Robert Grosthead*, who (both for Learning and Piety) was Inferior to none in his Age: He (on his Death-bed) having spoke of *many horrid Enormities of* Rome, *and loss of Souls by Papal Avarice*; he adds—(*d*) *Is not such a one deservedly call'd Antichrist? Is not a Destroyer of Souls* (the Pope he means) *an* (e) *Enemy of God and Antichrist?* And after a long

(d) *Episcopus dolens de jacturâ Animarum per Papalis Curiæ Avaritiam, suspirans ait: Christus devenit, ut animas Lucraretur.* Ergo, *qui animas perdere non formidat, nonne Antichristus merito dicendus est?* Matth. Paris in Hen. 3. ad Ann. 1253. p. 875.

(e) *Nonne ergo Animarum destructor inimicus Dei & Antichristus censetur?* Ibidem.

long List of Papal Tyranny and Impieties, he calls *Rome Egypt*; (so Saint *John* calls it (f) *Spiritually Sodom and Egypt*) and concludes *that the* (g) *Church will never be deliver'd from that Egyptian Servitude, but by the Sword.* 2. Nor is this all: we have great Councils of whole Nations, in their Publick Edicts and Constitutions, expresly declaring the Pope, to be that Antichrist, *who Exalts himself above all that is called God.* We have a Publick Edict, published by *Ludovicus Bavarus* Emperor, and his Counsel; wherein Pope *John* the Two and twentieth is call'd (h) *Antichrist, the Disturber of the Peace of Christendom, and the Bishops and Clergy who adhered to him, Messingers of Antichrist.* And not long after, the same Emperor, in a Diet or Counsel of the Bishops and Nobility of *Germany* and *Italy* too, and with their joynt Consent, publishes an Edict, in the Year 1328. wherein we have a long Catalogue of the Prodigious Impieties and Tyranny of the Pope, and then and there they call him—(i) *A Personated Pastor,* (one who would seem to be a Pastor of the Church) *but was indeed, That Mystical Antichrist.* And in the same great Counsel, they publish another Imperial Decree or Constitution, wherein having set down that Character of (k) Antichrist, *That he should Exalt himself above all that is called God, or worshipped*, and assume a Power and Domination over the whole World: They add, *That by many* (l) *Experiments, they saw these Predictions, come to pass, and* (*unless they*

(f) Rev. 11. 8.

(g) Ibid. p. 8-6. Edit. Watsij. *Nec Liberabitur Ecclesia ab Ægyptia servitute, nisi in ore Gladij Cruentati.*

(h) *Qui se Mysticas Christi ferunt, sunt Nuncij Antichristi —— Nec per hunc Antichristum, licet Christianis pacem à Deo datam servare.* Joh. Aventinus Annal. Bojorum, lib. 7. pag. 469. Editionis Basil. 1615.

(i) *Sicuti Pastor est Personatus, ita Mysticus est Antichristus.* Ibidem, p. 473. vid. Epist. Ecclesiæ Leodiensis ad Paschal. 2. apud Binium, Tom. 7. part. 2. p. 518.

(k) *In Templo Dei, hoc est, Ecclesiâ, quasi Deus, Sedebunt, & super Omne illud quod usquam Gentium, aut Colitur, aut cultum est, extollentur. Dominationem, Urbi orbique Terrarum, rejecta Cruce Christi, arripient, &c.*

(l) *Quæ ideo vates veridici, Nobis ante Cantarunt, verissima esse experimentis animadvertimus; & nisi planè Asini simus, Sentimus, &c.*

they were as ſtupid as Aſſes) they muſt be ſenſible of them; And then (*m*) Declare, *That all who adhere to, and follow the Pope, are Antichriſtians, and He Antichriſt.* I know that the *Roman* (*n*) *Inquiſitors* have call'd *Aventine*, *Author damatus*, an Author damn'd by them; and have noted all theſe places, I have Cited, to be Expunged; (I have the *Inquiſitors* own Book, wherein all the Places in *Aventine* are to that purpoſe, *Uncis incluſi*, and to be left out in all following Editions of *Aventine*). But the World knows, that they have (with great Impieties and Impudence) corrupted thouſands of Authors, putting out whatever makes againſt their Errors, and putting in, what makes the Author ſay, what he never meant. But their damnation of what *Aventine* ſays, out of the Imperial Conſtitutions, is no refutation of it; nor are thoſe things untrue becauſe they would have them Expunged: as the Second Commandment is no leſs Divine, and a part of the Decalogue, becauſe they leave it out. But enough of this; The Caſe is too plain, to need more proof.

But ſome ſay, *That Antichriſt is not yet come; nor will come till towards the end of the World.* And (*o*) *Bellarmin* ſays, *That this is the Opinion of Catholicks.* And ſome Learned Proteſtants (as *Grotius* and Doctor *Hammond*) ſay, *That Antichriſt is both come, and gone, 1600. years ago.* For *Caius Caligula* (*Grotius* his Antichriſt) died (*p*) *Anno Chriſti*, 43. And *Simon Magus* (who by Dr. *Hammond* is ſuppoſed to be Antichriſt) died (*q*) *Anno Chriſti*, 68. So that

(m) *Qui contra obſtrepere auſit, tanquam Reipubl. hoſtis, inimicus Pietatis & Satelles Antichriſti, ultimo Supplicio Parricidium luet.* Conditum eſt hoc Decretum. Ann. 1338. Extat apud Aventinum, Annal. Lib. 7. p. 479.

(*n*) The Portugal Index Expurgatorius. Olyſipone, 1624. pag. 29. damns *Aventine*, in General only. But the Spaniſh Index Expurgat. Madriti, 1612. & p. 449. and at Madrid, 1667. p. 562. Col. 2. ſets down particularly, all the paſſages to be Expunged.

Dubium.

(*o*) Bellarm. de Rom. Pontif. lib. 3. cap. 3. §. 1.

(*p*) Baronius Annal. Tom. 1. ad Ann. 43. §. 1.

(*q*) Item Tom. 1. ad Ann. 68. §. 16. 17.

that both *Caius* and *Simon Magus*, (who are their supposed Antichrists) are dead above a thousand six hundred years ago. Whence it will follow, That the Pope neither is, nor ever was, or can be Antichrist. For if either *Caius* the Emperor, or *Simon Magus* were then, when they lived, Antichrist, then the Pope was not; (neither of them being Bishop of *Rome*) and both of them being (so many Ages since) dead; the Pope neither is, nor ever can be Antichrist, unless you will have two great Antichrists; which no man yet ever did, or (with any Reason or Sense) can say.

Sol. 1. In Answer to this, I shall say a few things: And, 1. For *Bellarmine* (who says, *That the Catholick Opinion is, That Antichrist is not yet come*) I confess he, and all his Party are highly concern'd to say so. For if Antichrist be Actually come, then the Pope must be that *Man of Sin*; He (and none in the World but he) having all the Characters and Marks of Antichrist mention'd in Scripture, so plain, that he who runs may read them. 2. Though *Bellarmine* say, *'Tis the Catholick Opinion, that Antichrist is not yet come*; yet it evidently appears (by the many Authentick Testimonies before Cited, and the Authors were Papists) That Antichrist is come Six hundred years ago, and that the Pope was he, *Plerique Omnes Boni, &c.* (says the Historian before Cited) *Most Good Men believed* Rome *to be* Babylon, *and the Pope Antichrist.* 3. *Bellarmine* (r) Cites one, (and he Bishop of *Florence*, whose (s) Opinion was, *That Antichrist was then*

(r) Bellarm. de Rom. Pontif. Lib. 3. cap. 3. §. Refert. B. Augustinus.

(s) *Concilium Florentinum, Episcoporum* 340. *Præside Paschal.* 2. *contra Fluentinum illius Loci Episcopum, qui Motus Quotidianis Portentis, quæ tunc Accidebant, dicebat jam tum natum esse Anti-* [illegible]*n.* Genebrard. [illegible] ib. 4. ad Annum [illegible]55.

come

come, (almoſt (*t*) Six hundred years ago) and was ſeverely rebuked for it by Pope *Paſchal* the Second, in a Synod call'd by him at *Florence*. But *Bellarmine* might have named Five hundred more, (which he wiſely conceal'd, becauſe they were againſt him; and he neither had, nor could have any juſt Anſwer to ſo many, and ſo evident Teſtimonies) I ſhall only add (beſides thoſe before mention'd) one ſignal Teſtimony more, to ſhew, That even at *Rome* it ſelf, it was believ'd, that Antichriſt ſhould come in the end of the Tenth Century. I have ſeen (and the Book, if any deſire it, is ſtill to be (*u*) ſeen) a very Ancient and Excellent MS. Miſſal, belonging anciently to the Church and City of *Rome*, (for there are ſome particular Services in it, to be ſaid in ſome of the chief Churches in *Rome*) In this MS. Miſſal, in the beginning of it, there is a Chronological Table, in which (amongſt other things) we are told, That *à Chriſto ad Antichriſtum ſunt Anni. 999.* So that it was believ'd then at *Rome*, that Antichriſt ſhould come in the laſt year of the tenth Century: and if he did ſo, (and ſo it was believed then) *Sylveſter* the Second (a *Prodigious* (*x*) *Villain* was then Pope, *who was a famous* (or rather infamous) *Magician, and obtain'd the Popedom by the help of the Devil,* as their own *Platina*, and *Johan. Stella* tell us. I know their Writers and the Popes Paraſites ſince *Luther*, do (but without any juſt reaſon) queſtion the truth of what *Platina*, *Stella*, and others more ancient have ſaid of this *Sylveſter*; ſo (*y*) *Onuphrius*, *Papirius* (*z*) *Maſſonus*, and others; who

(*t*) Since that Council wherein he was cenſured, (Ann. 1105.) are 574 years paſs'd.

(*u*) In *Bodley*'s Library in Oxon. Cod. 76. ſuper D. Arts. The MS. was given to St. *Peter*'s Church in *Exceſter*, in *Edward* the Confeſſor's time, by *Leofricke*; firſt Biſhop of *Exon*, as appears by his own hand, in the beginning of that Manuſcript.

(x) *Malis Artibus Pontificatum adeptus eſt.--- Ambitione & Diabolicâ dominandi cupiditate Impulſus, Archiepiſcopatum Rhemenſem, dein Ravennatem, poſtremò Pontificatum, Adjuvante Diabolo, conſecutus.* And a little before, *Relicto Monaſterio. Diabolum ſecutus, cui ſe Totum tradiderit. &c.* Plat. in vitâ Sylveſt. 2. See the Hiſt. of Magick by *Gabr. Naudæus*, c. 19. pag. 255. & Johan. Stella de vitis Pontificum, (*opus reviſum & correctum ſub Julio.* 2. as we are told in the laſt page ſave one) Baſil. 1507. in vita Silveſtri. 2.

(*y*) In Annotat. ad vit. Silveſt. 2. apud Plat. Edit. 1626.

(*z*) In vitâ Silveſt. 2.

who againſt Truth, and the Faith of all former Hiſtorians, indeavour (*Æthiopem lavare*) to quit *Sylveſter* of all theſe Crimes, and make him (what he was not) an Excellent Perſon.

2. For (*a*) *Grotius*, who would have *Caius Caligula* to be Antichriſt, and Dr. *Hammond*, who thinks, that *Simon* (*b*) *Magus* and his *Gnoſticks* better deſerv'd that Name: I confeſs they were very Learned and Worthy men, but men; and had (as the beſt have) their Errors. *Optimus ille non qui nullis, ſed minimis urgetur.* Certainly it is as lawful for me (and not more immodeſtly) to contradict them, as it was for them to contradict all (Ancient and Modern) who ever writ on thoſe Paſſages in the Second to the *Theſſalonians*, concerning Antichriſt. I had, and have great reſpect and reverence for their Perſons, and Memory, but more for Truth; and therefore, the Apology of *Ariſtotle* (concerning the Errors of his Maſter *Plato*) may, and ſhall be mine. *Amicus Plato, μάλλον δὲ τ'αληθές.* He (whoever he be) who out of Reverence and Reſpect to any men (how great ſoever) either imbraces, or (when he knows them) conceals their Errors, wants Charity to himſelf, and others; who poſſibly (if he had not conceal'd them) might have avoided thoſe Errors, and gain'd the knowledge of Truth. In ſhort then, I conſider

1. That it is evident in the Apoſtle, that Antichriſt was not come when St. *Paul* writ that Epiſtle; for he tells them, (*c*) *That an Apoſtacy muſt firſt come, and that which hindred the Appear-*

(*a*) Grot. in 2. Theſſ. 2.4.5.

(*b*) Dr. *Hammond* on the ſame place, and more largely, contra D. Blondellum Diſſert. 1. Proœmialis. De Antechriſto.

(*c*) 2 Theſſ. 2.6.7.

ing

ing of Antichriſt, muſt be taken out of the way, (neither of which was done, when he writ that Epiſtle) *Grotius* ſaw this, and therefore (unleſs he would Contradict Truth and the Apoſtle) he could not make *Caius* Antichriſt, unleſs the Epiſtle were ſo dated, that it was writ before *Caius* appear'd. For this purpoſe, he tells us, *That* Paul *writ the Epiſtle*, Anno (*d*) Chriſti, 38. or, 40. *in the Second year of* Caius Caligula; *and* (he ſays) *that although* Caius *was Emperor before St.* Paul *writ this Epiſtle, yet his Impiety did not appear till afterwards; He in the beginning of his Reign carrying himſelf like a good Prince.* So that the main Hinge on which *Grotius* his Opinion turns, is this date of *Paul*'s Epiſtle: For if it was not writ before *Caius* appeared, (or the year, 40.) then 'tis evident that *Caius* cannot be Antichriſt, nor *Grotius* his Hypotheſis true. Now that this Epiſtle was writ in the Second year of *Caius Caligula* (which *Grotius* affirms) is ſo far from being true, that (by the Judgment and Conſent of the moſt Learned Chronologers (Papiſts and Proteſtants) it was writ at leaſt Seaven or Eight years after *Caius* was dead. Such, I mean, as the late Lord Primate of *Ireland* Dr. (*e*) *Uſher*, (*f*) *Baronius*, (*g*) *Simpſon*, (*h*) *A Lapide*, (*i*) *Calviſius*, *&c.* all of which Authors (and many more) ſay, and prove, that it could not be writ before the year of Chriſt, 50. and ſome of them, that it was writ *Anno Chriſti*, 53. or, 54. So that the Learned Primate of *Ireland* (Second to none in

(*d*) Secundum Computum Dionyſij vulgat. 38. ſed Ann. Chriſt. 40. ſecundum verum Computum. *Collegi* (inquit Grotius) *ſcriptam hanc Epiſtolam Anno Altero Caiani Principatus.* Grotius in Prologo ad 2. ad Theſſ.

(*e*) Uſſerius Annal. Part. poſteriori. Ætat. Mundi. 7. ad Ann. 54. p. 667. in which year he ſays, and proves this Epiſtle to be writ.

(*f*) Baronius Annal. Tom. 1. ad Ann. Chriſt. 53. §. 1. p. 408. In which year he ſays this Epiſtle was writ.

(*g*) Ed. Simpſon Chronici Cathol. part. 7. ad Ann. 51. p. 36. hoc Ann. 2. ad Theſſ. Epiſt. ſcriptam putat.

(*h*) Corn. A Lapide in Argumento ad. 2. ad Theſſ. & in Chronolaxi Actuum Apoſtolorum ad Ann. Chriſt. 53. pag. 4. quo Ann. 2. ad Theſſ. Epiſt. eſſe Scriptam aſſerit.

(*i*) Calviſius ad Ann. Chriſt. 50. hoc Ann. 2. ad Theſſ. ſcriptam vult.

Exactneſs in Chronology) ſpeaking of *Grotius* his date of this Epiſtle, ſays, (*k*) *That* Grotius *erred exceedingly, when he ſaid this Epiſtle was writ in the time of* Caius Caligula. 2. But that it may evidently appear, that St. *Paul* did not write this Second Epiſtle to the *Theſſalonians Anno Chriſt.* 40. (as *Grotius* ſays) but at leaſt Ten or Eleven years after; let it be conſider'd, 1. That it is a received Truth, that *Paul* was Converted *Anno Chriſt.* 34. 2. 'Tis certain in the Text, that *Paul* had been at (*l*) *Theſſalonica*, before he writ his Firſt Epiſtle to them. The Query then will be, When he came to *Theſſalonica:* For if he had not been there, before the year 40. *Grotius* his Hypotheſis will be evidently untrue. And that he was not, will appear from that Account Scripture gives of him, after his Converſion; Thus, 1. He himſelf tells us, that immediately after his Converſion, he (*m*) went into *Arabia*, and returned to *Damaſcus*; And then (*n*) after three years, he went to *Jeruſalem* (which was *Anno Chriſt.* 37. and (*o*) fourteen years after, he and *Barnabas* went up to *Jeruſalem* (*Anno Chriſt.* 51.) 2. He and *Barnabas* (ſent from *Antioch*) went to *Jeruſalem*, and were at the (*p*) Council of the Apoſtles there; which Council was held, *Anno Chriſt.* 47. ſays (*q*) *Simpſon*; *Ann.* 48. as the (*r*) *Magdeburgenſes* think; *Ann.* 50. ſays (*ſ*) *Helvicus*; *Ann.* 51. ſo (*t*) *Baronius*, (*u*) *Funccius*, (*x*) *A Lapide*, (*y*) *Bellarmine*, *&c.* *Anno Chriſt.* 52. ſays (*z*) Archbiſhop *Uſher.* Now let the Council be held

(*k*) Annal. part. poſteriori, Ætate Mund. 7. ad Ann. Chriſt. 54. p. 668. *Toto Cœlo erravit Grotius, cum hanc Epiſtolam ſub Caio exaratam exiſtimabat.*

(*l*) 1 Theſſ. 1. 5.

(*m*) Gal. 1. 17.
(*n*) Gal. 1. 18.
(*o*) Gal. 2. 1.
(*p*) Act. 15. 2.
(*q*) Chron. Catholici, part. 7. ad Ann. 47. p. 34.
(*r*) Centur. 1. Lib. 2. cap. 9. p. 420.
(*ſ*) Theatro Hiſt. ad dictum Annum.
(*t*) Tom. 1. ad Ann. 51. §. 6.
(*u*) Chronol ad dictū Annum. p. 93.
(*x*) In Chronotaxi, ad Ann. 51.
(*y*) In Chronot. ſua ad dictum Annum.
(*z*) Uſſerius Annal. Part. 2. ad Ann. 52. pag. 660.

held which of theſe years you pleaſe, it will utterly overthrow *Grotius* his Hypotheſis. For, 3. It is evident in the Text, that *Paul* at the time of that Synod, had not been at *Theſſalonica*, and ſo had writ no Epiſtle to them; ſeeing he ſays, (*a*) that he had been with them before he writ his Firſt Epiſtle. That he had not been at *Theſſalonica* at or before the time of the Council, appears by what *Luke* ſays of him after the Synod: who tells us, that he went to (*b*) *Antioch*; then through (*c*) *Syria* and *Cilicia*; then to (*d*) *Derbe* and *Lyſtra*, Circumciſed *Timothy*, and took him along with him. Then he went through (*e*) *Phrigia*, *Galatia*, and *Myſia*, and ſo to *Troas*. And (in a Viſion) being call'd to (*f*) *Macedonia*, he went to *Neapolis* and *Philippi*: and having paſs'd through *Amphipolis* and *Apollonia*, he came to (*g*) *Theſſalonica* (the firſt time he ever was there; but, as yet, had never writ to them. Thence he went to (*h*) *Berea*, (*i*) *Athens*, and (*k*) *Corinth*; At *Corinth*, *Aquila* and *Priſcilla* (baniſh'd from *Rome*, as all Jews were, by *Claudius*) came to him: and this was the Ninth year of *Claudius*, (that is, *Anno Chriſt.* 51.) as *Joſephus*, *Oroſius*, *Baronius*, *and all Chronologers* teſtifie, as a very Learned (*l*) Hiſtorian tells me: And he himſelf confeſſes, that *Paul came into* Greece (*m*) *Anno Claudij.* 9. that is, *Anno Chriſt.* 51. And yet *Paul* had writ no Epiſtle to the *Theſſalonians*, till *Timothy* (whom he left at *Theſſalonica*) came to him into (*n*) *Greece*, (as he himſelf tells us) ſo that by the Premiſſes, I

(*a*) 1. Theſſ. 1. 5.

(*b*) Act. 15. 30.
(*c*) Ibid. verſ. 41.
(*d*) Act. 16. 1. 2.

(*e*) Ibid. verſ. 6.
(*f*) Ib[illegible]

(*g*) Act. 17. [illegible]

(*h*) Ibid. verſ. 10.
(*i*) Ibid. verſ. 15.
(*k*) Act. 18. 1.
(l) *Oroſium ſecuti ſunt Omnes deinceps Chronographi; & Baronius, &c.* Hen. Valeſius in Notis ad Cap. 18. Lib. 2. Euſebij p. 37.
(m) *Paulus Anno ſecundum Claudij.* 9. *venit in Græciam.* Ibid. Col. 2. B.
(*n*) 1. Theſſal. 3. 2. 6. vide Hen. Holden Theolog. Pariſienſem in Tabula Geſtorum Pauli, in Calce N. Teſt. à ſe, cum Annotat. Edit. Par. 1660. p. 883. 884. ubi hæc Omnia firmat.

think it may, and does appear, that the Firſt Epiſtle to the *Theſſalonians*, was not only writ after the Synod of the Apoſtles, *Act.* 15. but after *Paul* had paſs'd through and preach'd in all thoſe Countries before mention'd, after he had been at *Theſſalonica*, left *Timothy* there, came into *Greece*, met *Aquila* and *Priſcilla* come from *Rome*, (which was *Anno Chriſt.* 51.) and *Timothy* was returned to him; then (and not till then) he writ his Firſt Epiſtle to the *Theſſalonians*; and therefore it is impoſſible *Caius Caligula* ſhould be Antichriſt; who was not come (as (*o*) St. *Paul* tells us) when he writ his Second Epiſtle, who yet was come and dead, at leaſt Seaven or Eight years before he writ the firſt. 3. And Dr. *Hammond* confirms what I have ſaid; who grants, that the Second Epiſtle to the (*p*) *Theſſalonians* was writ *Anno Chriſt.* 51. which was at leaſt Seaven or Eight years after *Caius* (*Grotius* his Antichriſt) was (*q*) dead and gone. So that (by (*r*) Dr. *Hammond*'s Principles) *Grotius* his Hypotheſis is utterly overthrown, and *Caius* the Emperor cannot poſſibly be that Antichriſt St. *Paul* ſpeaks of; who was not come, when he writ that Epiſtle.

(*o*) 2. Theſſ. 2. 6. 7.

(*p*) Dr. *Hammond* in the Prologue to his Annotat. on the Second to the *Theſſalonians*.

(*q*) Baronius Annal. Tom. 1. ad Ann. Chriſt. 43. §. 1. In which year 'tis certain *Caius* died.

(*r*) Dr. *Hammond* Annot. p. 718. Col. 2. ex Profeſſo proves that *Caius* could not be Antichriſt.

2. And by the ſame Principles, Dr. *Hammond* has evidently Confuted his own Opinion, and Excluded *Simon Magus* from all poſſibility of being Antichriſt. For that Doctor expreſly affirms two things; 1. That the Second Epiſtle to the *Theſſalonians*, was writ, in the year of our

our bleſſed Saviour, 51. 2. That then Antichriſt (when that Epiſtle was writ) was not come or reveal'd: which two things being granted, (as they muſt, for the Doctor ſays the one, and the Apoſtle the other) it evidently follows, that *Simon Magus* neither was, nor could be that Antichriſt the Apoſtle ſpeaks of in that Epiſtle. For it is certain, that *Simon Magus* was come, and his Hereſie and Prodigious Impiety diſcovered many years before. For, 1. It is certain, that when *Peter* and *John* were ſent to (*ſ*) *Samaria*, they met *Simon Magus* there; who though he had been (*t*) baptiz'd by *Philip* the Deacon, was no better for it, and Impiouſly offer'd (*u*) Money to purchaſe Power to give the Holy Ghoſt; *Peter* (curſing both (*x*) him and his Money) told him, *That he was in the* (*y*) *Gall of Bitterneſs, and the Bond of Iniquity.* 2. Now this was done, in the year of our bleſſed Saviour (*z*) 35. which was Fifteen or Sixteen years before, the Second Epiſtle to the *Theſſalonians* was writ, or Antichriſt come and revealed, (according to Dr. *Hammond*'s own Computation) And therefore it is impoſſible that *Simon Magus* ſhould be that Antichriſt, the Apoſtle ſpeaks of. For that from the year. 35. till after. 51. (for Sixteen years together) he ſhould not diſcover, but conceal his Impiety, (who was a Magician and an Impious Villain before, and then declared by *Peter*, to be in *the Gall of Bitterneſs, and Bond of Iniquity*) is utterly Incredible. Sure

(*ſ*) Act. 8.

(*t*) Ibid. verſ. 13.

(*u*) Verſ. 18.

(*x*) *Thy Money periſh with thee*, verſ. 20.

(*y*) Ibid. verſ. 23.

(*z*) Baronius Annal. Tom. 1. ad Ann. 35. §. 9. Ita etiam Hen. Holden, Dr. Theol. in Tabulâ Geſtorum Petri, in Calce N. Teſt. cum Annot. ſuis Edit. Pariſ. 1660. p. 881.

I am, that (*a*) *Baronius* and (*b*) *Nicephorus*, (to name no more) tell us, That after the Apoſtles were gone from *Samaria*, *Simon Magus* ſet himſelf againſt our bleſſed Saviour and his Apoſtles, (whom he thought only better Conjurers then himſelf) and by his Magick and Diabolical Arts ſeduced many Samaritans and Jews, and made them believe that he was the Son of God, &c. So far was he from Concealing his Impiety, till after the writing of that Second Epiſtle to the *Theſſalonians*, and the year. 51. That by all the Magick and Malice he had, he publickly ſeduc'd both Jews and Gentiles, long before that time; and ſo could not be that great Antichriſt St. *Paul* ſpeaks of. 2. But I neither ſhall, nor need bring any further proof of this Particular, (that *Simon Magus* had before the year. 51. diſcovered himſelf to be an Adverſary to our bleſſed Saviour, and his Apoſtles and Chriſtianity) becauſe Dr. *Hammond* himſelf (though in Contradiction and Evident Confutation of his own Hypotheſis) doth both Confeſs, and *ex profeſſo*, prove it. For he tells us—(*c*) *That after he was baptiz'd*, Act. 8. *he went on in his way of deceiving the People by Sorceries, as appears, by his deſiring to buy the Power of working Miracles from the Apoſtles, and being deny'd that, Soon after he ſet up, and oppoſed himſelf againſt Chriſt, and accordingly is here call'd* ὁ Ἀντικείμενος, *the Adverſary, &c.* where Dr. *Hammond* tells us, *That ſoon after* Simon's *being with the Apoſtles at* Samaria, *he diſcovered himſelf to be an Adverſary to Chriſt, our*

(a) *Magus cum inde receſſiſſent Apoſtoli, contra eos obniti, eorúmque Doctrinæ adverſari non dubitaret: & qui olim Samaritas dementarat, Judæos iiſdem Artibus aggreſſus, quos Apoſtolis Infenſos videat, ſe eſſe Dei Filium, illis Suadere Conatus eſt.* Baronius Annal. Tom. 1. ad Ann. 35. §. 20.

(b) Καὶ τοῦτον, &c. *Itáque hinc Simon Magus æmulatione percitus, contra Apoſtolos, eorúmque Doctrinam ſe Armavit.* Nicephor. Hiſtor. Eccleſ. Lib. 2. cap. 6. p. 141.

(c) Dr. *Hammond* in his Annotat. on 2. Theſſ. 2. 3. Lit. E. p. 719. Col. 1.

our bleſſed Saviour. Now 'tis certain, that his meeting the Apoſtles at *Samaria*, was *Anno* (d) *Chriſt.* 35. and ſo (by Dr. *Hammond*'s Computation, who ſays *that Epiſtle* (the Second to the *Theſſalonians*) *was writ Ann.* 51. that is, Fifteen or Sixteen years before Antichriſt came, and therefore it is impoſſible *Simon* ſhould be that Antichriſt *Paul* ſpeaks of, who was not come when he writ that Epiſtle, unleſs you will ſay, (which is highly irrational) that Antichriſt came Fifteen or Sixteen years, before St. *Paul* ſays he was to come. 3. Nor is this all; for the ſame Learned and Reverend (e) Doctor tells us, out of (f) *Euſebius*; *That* Simon Magus *came to* Rome, *in the Beginning of* Claudius *his Reign; where he did ſuch Miracles by the help of the Devil, that he was taken for a God, and had a Statue erected for him. And almoſt all the Samiritans, and ſome of other Nations confeſs'd him to be the firſt and principal God, and worſhipped him with all ſorts of Sacrifices, &c.* Theſe are his words; by which it is Evident (in the Doctors Opinion) that *Simon* was at *Rome*, *In the Beginning* of *Claudius* his Reign, and ſufficiently revealed to be an Adverſary to our bleſſed Saviour and the Goſpel, and prevailed ſo far, that (as (g) *Hierome* tells us) *Peter* went to *Rome*, *Anno Claudij.* 2. (which was *Anno Chriſt.* 44.) to oppoſe *Simon* and defend the Goſpel. Now all know, that *Claudius* began his Reign, *Anno* (h) *Chriſt.* 43. which was at leaſt Seaven or Eight years (in Dr. *Hammond*'s own Computation) before the Second

(d) Baronius Annal. Tom. 1. ad Ann. Chriſt. 35. §. 9.

(e) Dr. *Hammond* Annotat. on 2. Theſſ. 2. 3. litera d. p. 718. Col. 2.

(f) Euſebius Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt. lib. 2. cap. 12. In the Latin; but, 13. in the Greek.

(g) Hierome De Scriptor. Eccleſ. in Petro.

(h) Baronius Annal. Tom. 1. ad Ann. 43. §. 1.

Second Epiſtle to the *Theſſalonians* was writ, or Antichriſt come; And therefore *Simon Magus* could not be that Antichriſt *Paul* ſpeaks of, who was not come or reveal'd, when that Epiſtle was writ; whereas *Simon* was both come and reveal'd ſome years before.

3. Many things are ſaid of Antichriſt in Scripture, which cannot be applied to *Caius*, or *Simon Magus*, with any truth or probability. 1. Antichriſt was (by uſurpation) to have a *Supream Power* and Authority, (as our (*i*) Adverſaries confeſs) and ſhould make war with, and perſecute the Servants of Chriſt, and (as to killing the Body) *overcome* (k) *them, till he was drunk* (l) *with the Blood of the Saints.* This neither *Caius* nor *Simon Magus* did. *Caius* (though he had a Supream Power) was no perſecutor of Chriſtians; much leſs ſo far, as to be *drunk with their Blood.* *Nero* (*m*) was the firſt Roman Emperor who perſecuted Chriſtians; three and twenty years after *Caius* (*n*) was deed: And as for *Simon Magus* (a deſpicable and beggarly Magician) he never had any Power of the Sword, nor ever did, or could make War againſt the Chriſtians, much leſs overcome them, and be drunk with their blood. 2. But (that I may not trouble the Reader, nor my ſelf, with any more Particulars) I ſay (and think it an Evident Truth) that there is nothing ſaid in Scripture, or in the Works of the Fathers, or in any Writings of Eccleſiaſtical Authors, for Sixteen hundred years after our bleſſed Saviour, from

(*i*) Vide Hen Holden. Dr. Pariſienſ. in cap. 13. verſ. 1. Apoc. *vidi Beſtiam*; i.e. *Antichriſtum, habentem Cap.* 7. i. e. *Authoritatem Supremam, & Cornua.* 10. *id eſt, poteſtatem Maximam.* Vid. Grotium in dictum locum.

(*k*) Apoc. 13. 7.

(*l*) Apoc. 17. 6.

(*m*) Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 2. c. 25. περὶ τῶν ἀνελόντων, &c. Nero Rom. Imperat. primus Hoſtis, &c. Ita Tertullianus--- *Neronem primum in ſectam noſtram gladio ferociſſe.* Euſeb. in Chronico ad Ann. Chriſt. 70.

(*n*) *Caius* died *Anno Chriſt.* 43. and the firſt Perſecution under *Nero* was *Anno Chriſt.* 66. Baronius Tom. 1. ad Ann. 43. §. 1. & ad Ann. 66. §. 9.

from which it may but probably be concluded, that *Caius* the Emperor, or *Simon Magus*, was that great Antichriſt mention'd by St. *Paul* and St. *John*; But πᾶν τοὐναντίον, on the contrary, it does appear both by Scripture and the Conſent of Chriſtendom, for Sixteen hundred years, that neither of the two was, or poſſibly could be that great Antichriſt. For,

1. It does appear (by what is above ſaid) that what St. *Paul* ſays of Antichriſt, 2. *Theſſ.* 2. cannot be meant of *Caius* or *Simon Magus*; becauſe St. *Paul* in that place ſays expreſly, that when he writ that Epiſtle, the *Man of Sin*, and Son of Perdition *was not come and reveal'd.* And yet that Epiſtle being writ (as Dr. *Hammond* Confeſſeth) *Anno Chriſt.* 51. *Caius* was both come and dead at leaſt Seaven or Eight years before the year. 51. and therefore could not poſſibly be that Antichriſt who was not come till after it. And for *Simon Magus*, he was (as Dr. *Hammond* grants and proves) both come and reveal'd as many years (as *Caius* was dead) before St. *Paul* writ that Epiſtle; and conſequently before Antichriſt was come or revealed. And ſo he (who was come and reveal'd) could not be that Antichriſt, who (as St. *Paul* aſſures us) was not then come or revealed.

2. St. *Paul* elsewhere gives us some Characters of Antichrist, and his Adherents; as (o) *men giving heed to seducing spirits, speaking lies in Hypocrisie, forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God had created to be received, &c.* Where I observe, 1. That in the former place, (but now (p) spoken of) he told the *Thessalonians*, that an Apostasie must precede the coming of Antichrist; and he tells us, what kind of Apostasie it must be; (q) *A departing or falling from the Faith.* 2. That these two Marks of Antichrist (*forbidding marriage, and commanding to abstain from meats*) are such as none but the Pope can pretend to; who so severely forbids the marriage of the Clergy (Secular and Regular) *that it is a* (r) *greater sin* (with them) *for a Priest to marry* (though God Approves and Commands it) in such as otherwise have not the gift of Continence) *then it is for him to commit Fornication, and keep a Concubine.* Nay they say, *that a Priests marriage is* (s) *Incestuous, Sacrilegious, and worse then All Adulteries.* Nor is this Abominable Doctrine, the Opinion of any *private Doctor* only, but is approved as *Orthodox*, by (t) *several Universities.* So that in both these [*forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats*] what God in his Word expresly approves, the Pope condemns; and what God Commands, he Impiously Contradicts; and so evidently proves

(o) 1. Tim. 4. 1. 2. 3.
(p) 2. Thess. 2. 3.
(q) Ἀποστασίαν πρῶτον καὶ ἀποστασίας. 1. Tim. 4. 1.
(r) *Gravius peccat Sacerdos, si matrimonium contrahat, quam si fornicetur, & domi concubinam foveat.* Vid. Costeri Enchiridion, cap. 15. Propos. 9. p. 459. Edit. 1587.
(s) *Hæreticorum Ministri Sacerdotium Incestis Nuptiis fœdant; quæ non sunt Nuptiæ, sed Pejora Omnibus Adulteriis Sacrilegia.* Idem ibid. p. 460.
(t) See the Approbations of *Coster's Enchiridion* in the Beginning. Edit. Colon. 1587. & Edit. Turnoni, 1591. Where we have, 1. The Approbation of the University of *Mentz*; and they say, they had read it diligently; *Dignissimúmque judicasse quod in publicum prodiret, manibúsque Studiosorum Assiduè tereretur.* 2. The Universiry of Colon: *Approbat, Omnibúsque veritatis amantibus Plurimum Profuturum testatur.* 3. The University of Lovan: —— *Dignum judicat, quod adversus pestilentes nostri Temporis Sectariorum errores, Catholicorum manibus teratur.* 4. The Divines of *Triers:* —— *Enchiridion Costeri, quia & eruditè & Orthodoxè Per Omnia Scriptum, Summa Cum Utilitate legi possit.*

proves himſelf to be, *That Man of Sin, who Exalts himſelf above all that is called God.* 3. What the Apoſtle in this Epiſtle ſpeaks of the Apoſtaſie and Antichriſt which followed, is not of things paſt or then in being, but of things to come afterwards. For he expreſly ſays—(*u*) *That in the Latter Times ſome ſhould depart from the Faith, &c.* Neither *Apoſtaſie* nor *Antichriſt were then come*; but afterwards, *in the Latter times, ſhould come.* 4. Now he writ this Epiſtle, as ſome (*x*) think, *Anno Chriſt.* 54. or as ſome (*y*) others (and they far more) *Ann.* 57. or (as the moſt Exact (*z*) Chronologer) *Anno Chriſt.* 65.

(*u*) 1. Tim. 4. 1. ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς.

(*x*) So *Ed. Simſon* Chronol. Cathol. Part. 7. ad Ann. 54. p. 37.

(*y*) So Baronius Annal. Tom. 1. ad Ann. 57. Num. 189. ſo Ger. Mercator Atlant. Minoris Arnhemij, 1621. p. 676. In Itinerario Pauli. And ſo Corn. A Lapide in Chronotaxi, ad Ann. 57.

(*z*) Jac. Uſſerius Armachanus Annal. Part. 2. ad Ann. Chriſt. 65. pag. 688.

Now let my Adverſaries chuſe which Computation they will, for the date and time of writing this Epiſtle; let it be (if they pleaſe) the year 54. which is furtheſt from Truth, yet moſt favourable to their Opinion. I ſay, admit that this firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy* was writ by St. *Paul*, *Ann.* 54. yet it will appear by the Premiſſes, 1. That Antichriſt was not then come, nor revealed, becauſe St. *Paul* ſays ſo. 2. And therefore, that neither *Caius* nor *Simon Magus* could be Antichriſt; Becauſe *Caius* was both come and dead ten or eleven years before; and *Simon Magus* was come, and his Hereſie and Impieties revealed (as Dr. *Hammond* grants and proves) long before that time.

3. After (*a*) this, St. *Paul* ſpeaks of this *Apoſtaſy* from the Faith; but ſtill as of a thing not yet come, but to come in future (*b*) times; ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, *in the laſt times*; ſo that if St. *Paul* ſay true, that great Apoſtaſie (which was to (*c*) preceed the coming of Antichriſt, was not come when he writ that Epiſtle, which was (as the Learned Primate of *Ireland* Dr. *Uſher* thinks) *Anno Chriſt.* 66. or (as *Baronius*) *Anno Chriſt.* 59. And therefore it is impoſſible that *Caius* or *Simon Magus* ſhould be Antichriſt, both come, and their Villanies revealed long before.

4. St. *Peter* writ his Second Epiſtle a little before his Martyrdom; for ſo he himſelf ſays —(*d*) *Knowing that I muſt ſhortly put off this Tabernacle*, (or that my death haſtens) now an Exact (*e*) Chronologer tells me (and proves) that he died *Ann.* 67. and writ this (*f*) Epiſtle *Anno Chriſt.* 66. I do know that ſome (*g*) ſay he writ it *Anno Chriſt.* 67. and *Baronius* ſays (*h*) he writ it *Anno* 69. But, 2. which of thoſe years ſoever it was writ in, the great Apoſtaſie (which preceeded the coming of Antichriſt) was future and afterwards to come. So he himſelf tell us, (*i*) *But there were falſe Prophets among the People, even ſo* (ἔσονται) *there ſhall be falſe Teachers among you, who privily ſhall bring in damnable Hereſies, &c.* Theſe falſe Prophets and the great Apoſtaſie were (when he writ that Epiſtle) future and to come. And therefore

(*a*) In his Second to *Tim.* 3. 1. 2. 3. &c. which Epiſtle was writ, ſays *Baronius*, Ann. Chriſt. 59. Annal. Tom. 1. ad Ann. 59. num. 19. And Archbiſhop *Uſher* ſays it was writ *Anno Chriſt.* 66. Annal. Part. 2. ad dictum Annum, p. 691.

(*b*) 2. Tim. 3. 1.

(*c*) 2. Theſſ. 2. 3.

(*d*) 2. Pet. 1. 14. ταχινή ἐστιν ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματός μου, velox eſt depoſito tabernaculi mei. Verſio Vulgata.

(*e*) Jac. Uſſerius Armach. Annal. Part. 2. ad Ann. 67. p. 691. vide Lyranum in Gloſſa ad Prologum Hieron. m. in. 7. Epiſt. Canonicas, & Hieronymum, De Illuſt. Eccleſ. Doctoribus, c. 1.

(*f*) Idem Uſſerius ibid. p. 691.

(*g*) Simpſon Chron. Cathol. Part. 7. ad Ann. 67. p. 44.

(*h*) Baronius Annal. Tom. 1. ad Ann. 69. §. 1.

(*i*) 2. Pet. 2. 1.

fore 'tis certain *Caius* or *Simon Magus* could not be Antichriſt. For if it was writ in the year. 66. *Caius* was come, dead and gone three and twenty years before; and *Simon Magus* his Hereſies and Impieties publickly reveal'd and known, as is afore prov'd, even by Dr. *Hammond* himſelf.

5. In the *Revelation*, St. *John* does more fully deſcribe Antichriſt; That (k) *he roſe out of the Sea, with ſeaven Heads and ten Horns, and on his Horns ten Crowns, &c. That he ſhould make War* (l) *with the Saints, overcome them, and be drunk with their blood; That his Seat ſhould be* (m) Rome, *myſtically, or* (n) *ſpiritually call'd* Egypt, Sodom, *and* Babylon; *That ten* (o) *Kings ſhould give their Power to that Beaſt, aid and aſſiſt him in his Tyranny and Impieties; That thoſe Kings ſhould at laſt forſake him, and utterly deſtroy* (p) *him, and burn and utterly deſtroy* (q) Babylon (*or* Rome) *his Seat, never to be inhabited any more:* Which is ſuch a Deſcription of the great Antichriſt, as never can (with any truth or probability) be attributed to *Caius Caligula* or *Simon Magus*. 2. But that which here, I more particularly preſs, is, 1. That St. *John* in the *Revelation* ſpeaks of *Antichriſt*, (not as paſt, or preſent, but) as future, and yet to come, when he writ that Book (as is evident in the Text, and is, and muſt be confeſs'd. 2. And it is as certain, and generally agreed upon, that he writ the *Revelation* in (r) *Patmos*

(k) Rev. 13.1.

(l) Rev. 17.6.

(m) Rev. 17.18.
(n) Rev. 11.8.

(o) Rev. 17. 12. 13.

(p) Ibidem verſ. 16. 17.

(q) Rev. 18. 2. 21.

(r) Rev. 1.9.

mos (whither he was baniſh'd by (*ſ*) *Domitian*) *Anno* (t) *Chriſt.* 97. The Premiſſes being granted, (as they ought and muſt; being built upon better Authority, then any is, or can be for the contrary, 1. That Antichriſt was future and to come, when St. *John* writ the *Revelation*. 2. That he writ it *Anno Chriſt.* 97. It will evidently follow, that it was impoſſible, that either *Caius* the Emperor, or *Simon Magus*, ſhould be that great (*u*) Antichriſt. *Caius* being dead four and fifty, and *Simon* (*y*) *Magus* nine and twenty years before St. *John* writ the *Revelation*, and ſo before Antichriſt was to come. I know that the Reverend Dr. (*y*) *Hammond* indeavours to prove, that *John* was in *Patmos*, and writ the *Revelation* there in the time, and about the ninth year of *Claudius*, which was *Anno Chriſt.* 51. which was ſix and forty years before the time I have aſſigned for St. *Johns* being in *Patmos*, and writing the *Revelation*. Now for his Opinion, Dr. *Hammond* neither has, nor pretends to any Teſtimony of Antiquity, ſave only that of (*z*) *Epiphanius*; who in that particular is miſerably miſtaken, (as he is in many more) as is (*a*) confeſs'd and prov'd by Learned men, and they ſuch, who have a due Reverence for the Fathers, and particularly

(*ſ*) *Johannes Apocalypſin viderat, pene ſub noſtro ſeculo, ad Finem Domitiani Imperij.* Irenæus adverſ. Hæreſ. l. 5. p. 259. Col. 2. Edit. Eraſmi. So Euſebius Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 3. c. 23. where he cites *Clemens Alexandr.* for the ſame purpoſe. So the Acta Martyrij Timothei, apud Photium Biblioth. Cod. 254. p. 1402. 1403. So Oroſius Hiſt. l. 7. c. 10. 11. p. 598. And ſo Hierom, de Doct. Eccleſiæ Illuſt. c. 9. ad Ann. 97.

(*t*) Baronius Annal. Tom. 1. ad Ann. 97. §. 1.

(*u*) The *Revelation* was writ *Anno Chriſt.* 97. *Caius* died *Ann.* 43. (Baronius Annal. Tom. 1. ad An. 43. §. 1.) and ſo was dead 54. years before Antichriſt came.

(*x*) *Simon Magus* died *Anno Chriſt.* 68. (Ita Baronius, ex Euſebio, Epiphanio, &c. Tom. Annal. 1. ad Annum Chriſt. 68. §. 17. 18.) which was 29. years before the *Revelation* was writ, or Antichriſt come, if St. *John* ſays true.

(*y*) Dr. *Hammond* in his Premonition to his Annotat. on the *Revelation*, p. 906. & 907.

(*z*) Epiphanius Hæreſi. 51. §. 12. & 33.

(*a*) Baronius Annal. Tom. 1. ad Annum. 99. §. 2. Dionyſius Petavius in Notis ad Epiphan. Hæreſin. 51. Num. 33. & Baronius Ibid. ad An. 93. §. 9. D. Blondellus de Sybillis, lib. 2. cap. 2. Poſſevin. in Apparat. verbo Apoſtolus, p. 814. &c

larly

larly for *Epiphanius*. 2. That St. *John* ſhould be baniſh'd, and write the *Revelation* under *Claudius*, (which only Dr. *Hammond* and (*c*) *Grotius* ſay (out of *Epiphanius*) to give ſome Colour to their new and contradictory Hypotheſis) is evidently againſt the concurrent Senſe and Teſtimonies of Ancient and Modern Authors. For beſides *Irenæus*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Euſebius*, *Acta Martyrij Timothei apud Photium*, *Hierome*, and *Oroſius* (before Cited) *Johan.* (d) *Malela Antiochenus*, (e) *Haymo*, (f) *Arethas*, *Ado* (g) *Viennenſis* (and many more) conſtantly ſay; That *John* was baniſh'd into *Patmos*, not by *Claudius*, but by *Domitian*, and writ his *Revelation* there. 3. But I ſhall not go about any further proof of this; For Dr. *Hammond* has ſaved me the Labour, and confeſs'd it; For it is certain from the Text, that *Antipas* had ſuffer'd Martyrdom, before *John* writ the *Revelation*; *John* himſelf telling us (*h*) ſo, *Thou haſt not deny'd my faith, when* Antipas *my faithful Martyr was ſlain among you.* So that 'tis Evident, *Antipas* had ſuffer'd Martyrdom before *John* writ his *Revelation*. Now *Antipas* ſuffer'd, and was ſlain by *Domitian*, in the Second Perſecution of the *Chriſtians*, which was *Anno Domitiani.* 10. *Chriſti.* 92. So the Old *Roman* (i) *Martyrology*, and (*k*) *Baronius* aſſures us; and Dr. (*l*) *Hammond* confeſſes it, *That* Antipas *ſuffer'd Martyrdom under* Domitian. Whence it evidently follows,

(*c*) Grot. in Apocalyp. 1. 9.

(*d*) Joh. Malela in Domitiano MS. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana Oxon. pag. 161. alias 171.

(*e*) Haimo Hiſt. lib. 3. cap. 15. pag. 55.

(*f*) Arethas in Apocalyp. cap. 1. 9.

(*g*) Ado Viennenſis in Chronico, ad Annum Chriſt. 84. apud Laurent. de la Barre, p. 493.

(*h*) Rev. 2. 13.

(*i*) Martyrologium Romanum ad diem Apr. 11.

(*k*) Baronius Annot. ad Martyrologium Roman. ad dictum diem April. 11. & Annal. Tom. 1. ad Ann. Chriſt. 93. §. 9.

(*l*) Dr. *Hammond* in Annotat. ad Apocal. 2. 13. lit. 1. pag. 927. Col. 1.

lows, That St. *John* ſpeaking of *Antipas* his Martyrdom, as a thing paſt when he writ his *Revelation* (and that in *Domitian*'s time) he could not write it in *Claudius* his time, who was dead (*m*) *eight or nine and twenty years before* Domitian *came to the Empire.* So that *Antipas* being put to death, in *Domitian*'s time, (as Dr. *Hammond* affirms) and St. *John* in the *Revelation*, mentioning his Martyrdom as a thing paſt, when he writ; 'tis Evident, that he writ that Book after the death of *Antipas*, and ſo in, or after *Domitian*'s time, and not in the time of *Claudius.*

6. St. *John* in his firſt (*n*) Epiſtle, ſpeaks of Antichriſt *as then to come*, when he writ that Epiſtle. *It is the laſt time* (ſaith he) *and as you have heard that Antichriſt ſhall come, even now there are many Antichriſts, &c.* Here two things (I conceive) are *Evident*; 1. That νῦν, *nunc*, when St. *John* writ this Epiſtle; there were *many Antichriſts*; that is, *many* (o) *falſe Prophets and Hereticks* forerunners of Antichriſt, who made way for him. 2. And that the *great Antichriſt*, ὁ Ἀντίχριστος, *was to* (p) *come*, when St. *John* writ. This *Oecumenius*, *Bede*, *Eſtius*, and *generally* all *Commentators* (Ancient and Modern, Proteſtant and Papiſt) which I have yet met with, conſtantly affirm. 'Tis true, that when St. *John* ſays (*q*) *afterward*, that Antichriſt was *Now in the World already*: they truly Explain it, that the meaning is, That he is *now* in the World;

(*m*) Moritur Claudius Ann. Chriſt. 55. ſeu 56. Baronius ad An. Chriſt. 56. §. 42. & Domitianus Imperium adiit Anno Chriſt. 84. Baronius ad dictum Annum. §. 1. And hence it appears, that *Claudius* died either

$\left.\begin{matrix}84\\55\\29\end{matrix}\right\}$ *Twenty nine, or,* $\left\{\begin{matrix}84\\56\\28\end{matrix}\right.$

Twenty eight years before Domitian *came to the Empire.*

(*n*) 1 Joh. 2. 18. & cap. 4. 3.

(*o*) *Nunc multi ſunt Antichriſti* (λέγει ὁ Κύριος καὶ τοὺς ὁμοίους) *qui unum illum præcedunt, itèrque illi parant:* προσδοκώντων τὸν πολλῶν ἀντίχριστον τῷ ἑνί. Oecumenius in 1. Johan. Epiſtol. cap. 2. p. 573. C. D. So *Bede*, *Eſtius*, &c. in. 1. Joh. 2. 18. So *Gagnæus*. Ibid. &c.

(p) Τὸν Ἀντίχριστον ὃν ἐσχάτοις καιροῖς προσδοκῶμεν. Idem Ibidem. *Nunc multi ſunt Antichriſti; qui Omnes Maximo illi Antichriſto In Finem Seculi Venturo, qui ſi ſuo Capiti, Teſtimonium creddunt.* Beda in. 1. Joh. 2. 18.

(*q*) 1. Joh. 4. 3. Ἀντίχριστος ὃ νῦν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἤδη.

World; *Not* (r) *perſonally, but in reſpect to his Forerunners* (*falſe Prophets and Hereticks*) *who make way for him.* I take it then for a certain truth, that when St. *John* writ this Epiſtle, ὁ Ἀντίχριστος, *The Antichriſt*, or (as Venerable *Bede* calls him) *Maximus ille Antichriſtus*, was *future*, and *to come*. And (which is ſomething ſtrange) *Grotius* confirms what I have ſaid (which makes much for mine, but little for his purpoſe) For, 1. He *grants*, that this Text (1. *Joh.* 2. 18.) ſpeaks of (*ſ*) Antichriſt, as *future*, and *to come*. For though the *word here* (and cap. 4. verſ. 3.) be ἔρχεται; in the *Preſent Tenſe*, yet *Grotius confeſſes*, that it muſt *be taken in the* (t) *future*; *Veniet Antichriſtus*, Antichriſt *will come*. 2. He ſays, that amongſt thoſe many Antichriſts St. *John* here ſpeaks of, there ſhall be one (*u*) more *Eminent*, which he ſays was *Barcochebas, who appeared not* (he ſays) *till the Emperor* Adrian's *time* (*which was* (*x*) *long after St.* John *writ this Epiſtle*). And he further ſays, (in Confirmation of what is aforeſaid) (*y*) *That the falſe Chriſts, Hereticks, and falſe Prophets*, (which *John* calls Antichriſts) *do make way for that Great and Eminent Antichriſt.*

I take it then for certain, (and confeſs'd by *Grotius*) that the *great Antichriſt was not come*, when St. *John* writ this Epiſtle. The next thing to be inquired after, is, *When this Epiſtle was writ*; for if it was writ after *Caius Caligula*, and *Simon Magus* were dead, then it will be undeniably Evident,

(r) *Jam in Mundo eſt*; ὁ Σαμαλικὸς ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν προσδοκωμένην τῶν πολλῶν Ἀντιχείσων πρόνοιαν. Oecumenius ibidem καὶ ſ. p. 587. D.

(*ſ*) Vide Grotium in 1. Joh. 2. 18.

(t) Ἔρχεται, *eſt ſono præſens, ſenſu futurum.* Grotius in 1. Joh. 4. 3.

(u) *Inter Antichriſtos, unus futurus erat Cæteris Eminentior, ad quem Locus* 1. Joh. 4. 3. *pertinet, is vero non alius fuit quam Barchochebas.* Grotius in 1. Joh. 2. 18.

(*x*) Apparuit Barchochebas Ann. Chriſt. 130. Adrian. 11. apud Baronium, Annal. Tom. 2. ad Ann. 130. Num. 4. 5.

(*y*) Grotius in. 1. Joh. 4. 3. *Talis Prophetia* (he ſpeaks of the Propheties of falſe Chriſts, and Prophets) *viam ſtruit Magno Ipſi & Eximio Antichriſto.*

that neither of them could be that *great Antichrist*, of whom St. *John* speaks; who (when he writ this Epistle) was *future*, and *to come*. Now here it is to be considered,

1. That 'tis a common and received Opinion amongst Learned men, that St. *John* writ this Epistle *Anno* (z) *Christ.* 99. or at least after (a) *the death of Domitian* (which was *Anno Christ.* 95.) So *Baronius*, *Gavantus*, *Lyranus*, (in the places cited) and many others. Now if this Computation be true, (as in the Opinion of very many Learned men it is) then *Grotius his Antichrist*, (the Emperor *Caius Caligula*, who died *Anno Christ.* 42. was dead seaven and fifty years before *John* writ this Epistle; and therefore seaven and fifty years before Antichrist came; for St. *John* says, *he was future, and to come when he writ.* And for *Simon Magus* (Dr. *Hammond's* Antichrist) it is (b) certain, he died *Anno Christi* 68. and so One and thirty years before Antichrist was come.

2. But *be this as it will*; I shall not (*though I might*) stand upon it; but take the Computation which both (c) *Grotius*, and Dr. (d) *Hammond* approve; for they both agree in this, that St. *John* writ this Epistle *a little before the destruction of* Jerusalem; and (in the places cited) indeavour to prove it. 2. This being granted; it is further certain, that the *Excidium Hierosolymorum*, was in the *second year of Vespasian*; that is, *Anno Christ.* 72. That this is so, (e) *Josephus*, (f) *Eusebius*, (g) *Jac. Usserius Armachanus*, (h) *Baronius*,

(z) So Baronius Annal. Tom. 1. ad Annum Christ. 99. Num. 7. Bart. Gavantus Comment. in Rubricas, Breviarij Rom. Sect. 5. p. 84.

(a) *Johannes vero nullam post Evangelium & Epistolas Scripsit; Scilicet post mortem Domitiani; quia reversus de Exilio invenit Ecclesiam per Hæreticos perturbatam, & tunc, Scripsit Evangelium & Epistolas contra Ipsos.* Lyranus in Glossa ad Prologum Hieronymi in septem Epist. Canonicas.

(b) Baronius Annal. Tom. 1. ad Ann. 68. Num. 16. 17. &c.

(c) *Puto Scriptam hanc Epistolam non multo ante Excidium Hierosolymorum.* Grotius Annot. in. 1. Johannis, In Principio.

(d) *This Epistle seems to have been writ A Little Before the great destruction which befell the Jews, &c.* Dr. *Hammond* in his Prologue to his Annot. on the first of *John*.

(e) Josephus de Bello Judaico, lib. 7. cap. 47. p. 969.

(f) Eusebius in Chronico ad Ann. 72.

(g) Usserius Annal. part. 2. p. 698.

(h) Baronius Annal. Tom. 1. ad Ann. 72. Num. 20.

Baronius, &c. aſſure us. 3. And hence it evidently follows, That both *Caius Caligula* and *Simon Magus* were dead before the year. 72. when Antichriſt (as St. *John* aſſures us) was not come. *Caligula* being dead thirty, and *Simon Magus* four years before that time.

By the Premiſſes (I believe) it *may*, and *does appear, that in Scripture*, *Antichriſt* (the *great Antichriſt*) *is never ſpoken of, but as future and to come:* and therefore it is impoſſible by *Scripture*, (and there is *no other Medium* can do it) to prove that Antichriſt *was come*, in any part of that time *in which Scripture was writ.* 2. And as the *Apoſtles believed and writ*, that in their times, (even in St. *John's*, who lived (*i*) longeſt) Antichriſt *was not come.* So the *Fathers*, and *Eccleſiaſtical Writers* after them, for about a thouſand years generally, (if not univerſally) ſpeak of Antichriſt as ſtill *future*, and (in their ſeveral times) *to come.* I know that ſome (*k*) anciently (and wildly) thought, that *Nero* was Antichriſt, and as much might be ſaid for him, as *Grotius* has ſaid for *Caligula*) but they ſaid, that he was to riſe again, and come *Sub Seculi Finem*, and Act as Antichriſt. But I never yet read or heard of any, beſides the Learned *Grotius* and Dr. *Hammond*, who (in *Sixteen hundred years after our bleſſed Saviour*) ever ſeriouſly *affirm'd*, that *Caligula*, or *Simon Magus* was *Antichriſt:* The two Learned Perſons (before mention'd) are the firſt, and they *Contradict each other, themſelves*, the *received Opinion* of the *Chriſtian World*, and *gratifie Rome*; whilſt they indeavour

(*i*) Hierom. de Illuſt. Eccleſ. Doctoribus, c. 9. ſays St. *John* liv'd 68. years after the Paſſion of our bleſſed Saviour, to which if we add 34. (the year of the Paſſion) it will appear that St. *John* died *Anno Chriſt.* 102. Trajan. 2. vol. 3.

(*k*) Vid. Baronium Annal. Tom. 1. ad Ann. Chriſt. 70. Num. 34. ex Auguſtino, De Civitate Dei, lib. 20. c. 19. where he ſays, That by thoſe words (2. Theſſ. 2. 7.) *Myſterium Iniquitatis jam operatur*; *Neronem voluerit Intelligi: cujus jam factâ velut Antichriſti videbantur.* So *Athanaſius* tells us, that *Conſtantius* (the *Arian* Emperor) acted all thoſe things, which are ſpoken of Antichriſt, but was not *that Antichriſt* ſpoken of in Scripture, (for he was future, and to come, ſays *Athanaſius*) *Quid Igitur Hic* (Conſtantius) *Quod Antichriſti Eſt, Omiſit? aut Quid Ille ubi Venerit, plus committere poterit?* Athanaſius Epiſtola ad Solit. vitam Agentes. p. 236.

(which neither they, nor any body elſe can do) to free the Pope from being the *great Antichriſt*. For if either *Caligula*, or *Simon Magus* (who have been *dead this Sixteen hundred years and more*) be *that Antichriſt*, then (unleſs you will *have two or three ſuch Antichriſts*) *The Pope is ſecure*, and (wrong'd by thoſe who call him ſo) miſcall'd Antichriſt. *Sed ſalva res eſt*, there is little danger from ſuch extravagant Opinions; they will neither be beneficial to the Pope, nor prejudicial to his Adverſaries, to believe and prove him to be Antichriſt. That *Caligula*, or *Simon Magus*, was that great Antichriſt, *none*, or (if any) *very few believe*. The *Reformed Churches* ſay, that the *Pope is Antichriſt*, and have great reaſon to ſay ſo: many of the *Propheties*, and *Predictions of him* in Scripture, being *now actually fulfilled*, and ſo the truth of the Prediction made *Evident*, and eaſie to be *underſtood by the Event*. On the other ſide the Popiſh Party ſay, *that Antichriſt is not yet come*; and ſo neither Party does believe *Caligula* or *Simon Magus* to be Antichriſt; becauſe it is a Novel and Apocryphal Hypotheſis (take which of the two you will) without truth or probability. Sure I am, that the Reaſons thoſe two Learned Perſons bring for their Opinions, are evidently Illogical and Inconſequent. For, 1. If *Grotius his proofs* for *Caligula*, be cogent and concluding, then Dr. *Hammonds* for *Simon Magus* are Inconſequent; and if Dr. *Hammonds* be Good, thoſe of *Grotius* are not. Whence 'tis evident, that all the proofs of the one Party, (at leaſt) are Impertinent, and

to

to prove his Poſition Inſufficient. 2. But indeed all the Reaſons they both bring, to prove their ſeveral Poſitions, are (as I ſaid) Illogical and Inconſequent. That this may not be *gratis dictum*; *I* ſay,

1. That *both their proofs* are built and rely *upon the ſame ground*; they take (not all, but) only ſome of the *Characters and Marks of Antichriſt* which the Apoſtles give him in Scripture.
2. They indeavor to accommodate and apply thoſe Marks to *Caligula*, or *Simon Magus*; and think they make it appear, that ſuch Marks are really found in *Caligula* or *Simon Magus*.
3. And hence they Argue and Conclude thus—*Such Marks of Antichriſt are to be found in* Caligula, *or* Simon Magus: Ergo, *They* (*the one of them at leaſt*) *are that Antichriſt:* Or (which is all one) *Magus* and Antichriſt agree in ſome things; *Ergo*, They are the ſame.
4. Now ſuch Arguing is *miſerably Illogical and Inconſequent*; and no better then this—*A Duck and a Gooſe do agree in many things* (each of them has one Head, two Legs, two Eyes, a flat Bill or Beak, and ſometimes Feathers of the ſame colour, &c.) *Ergo*, A Duck is a Gooſe. Or thus —*Sempronius and Titius agree in many things* (*they have the ſame Father and Mother*, *Romans both*, *born in the ſame Hour*, (being Twins) *bread at the ſame School*, *both good Scholars*, *&c.* Ergo, *Titius* is *Sempronius*. The Reaſons thoſe Learned men bring to prove their ſeveral Antichriſts, prove no more then thoſe I have given; that is, juſt nothing.

5. The

5. The reason of such Inconsequence, in such Arguments, is this; Young Sophisters in the University can tell you, out (*l*) of *Porphyrie*, *Aristotle*, and their Scholiasts) That *every individual person* or *thing*, is made up, and does consist of such *Properties and Qualifications*, *Quorum Collectio nunquam in aliquo alio Eadem esse potest.* It is certain, that a *Collection* of all the *Properties and Qualifications* which Constitute any *Individual person*, cannot be *in any other* person whomsoever; though it is *as certain*, that *some of them may.* Now had *Grotius* or Dr. *Hammond* taken a *Collection of all the Characters and Marks of Antichrist*, given *him in Scripture*, and made it *appear*, that all those Marks had been *really found in Caius Caligula*, or *Simon Magus*, their proofs *had been Logical and Consequent*, (This they *neither did, nor could*) But their *accommodation and applying only some of the Marks of the Beast*, to *Caius* or *Magus*, and thence Concluding that they were Antichrist, such deductions are *evidently Illogical and Inconsequent.* And so much the more Inconsequent, because even *those marks of Antichrist* which they *indeavour to prove* to be *really* in *Caligula* or *Simon Magus*, never were in either of them, in *that sense* and *extent*, in which *they were* (and since his *coming are*) to be found in Antichrist. If any man *censure* me (as may be some will) for contradicting those two Learned Persons (Dr. *Hammond* and *Grotius*) all the Apology I shall make, (for it needs none) is only this; It is as lawful for me to con-

(l) Ἄλλα ϗ λέγεσθαι τὰ τοιαῦτα, ὅτι ἐξ ἰδιοτήτων συμέστηκεν ἕκαστον, ὧν τὸ ἄθροισμα οὐκ ἂν ἀπ' ἄλλου τινὸς ποτε τὸ αὐτὸ γένοιτο. Porphyrius in Isagog. c. 2. §. 38.

contradict them, in defence of evident truth; as it was for them to contradict each other, and the Chriſtian World, in *defence of a manifeſt Error.*

9. The Pope in this his Impious and Lying Bull, declares the Queen to be (*what he really was*, and *ſhe was not*) *a* (m) *Slave of Sin*, *a* (n) *Heretick*, and *a favourer of Hereticks:* And then (with a prodigious Antichriſtian Pride and Impiety) pronounceth his *Penal Sentence* againſt her, of *Damnation, Excommunication, Deprivation, &c.* And here it is further to be obſerved;

Obſerv. 9.

(m) *Elizabetha prætenſa Angliæ Regina, Flagitiorum Serva.* Bulla. §. 1.

(n) *Declaramus prædictam Elizabeth Hæreticam & Hæreticorum fautricem.* §. 3.

1. What this *Papal Power* is (and *whence he has it*) which he pretends to inable and authorize him, to ſit Judge and paſs ſuch Damnatory Sentences againſt Princes and Supream Powers, for Hereſie.
2. What that Hereſie is, and who the Hereticks, who (by the Pope) are ſo ſeverely damn'd for it.
3. What thoſe puniſhments are, which they pretend they may, and actually do Inflict upon ſuch Hereticks.

1. For the firſt, *Pius* the Fifth, in the beginning of this Impious Bull, tells us; that this Papal Power *is Divine.* For he ſays—(o) *That our bleſſed Saviour did Conſtitute* Peter *and his Succeſſors, the Popes of* Rome, *Princes over all Nations, and Kingdoms, with a Plenitude of Power, to Pull up, Diſſipate, and Deſtroy, &c.* Thus he, and ſo others, in their Damnatory Bulls; but with ſome variation; and (if it were poſſible) in ſuch words as are more Extravagant, Erroneous, and Impious. I ſhall

(o) *Chriſtus Soli Petro, Petrique Succeſſori, Romano Pontifici, in Poteſtatis, plenitudine Eccleſiam tradidit Gubernandam. Hunc Unum ſuper Omnes Gentes & Omnia Regna Principem Conſtituit, qui Evellat, Deſtruat, Diſſipet, Diſperdat, &c.* In dictæ Bullæ Principio.

ſhall only Inſtance in one; *Paulus* the Fourth, who was next Predeceſſor (ſave one) to *Pius* the Fifth, who in his Bull (*p*) *againſt Hereticks and Schiſmaticks and their Favourers*, expreſſes his power to damn them, thus—(*q*) *The Pope of* Rome *here in Earth is Vicar, or Vice-Roy of God and our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and has Plenitude of Power over Nations and Kingdoms, and is Judge of All men, and not to be Judged by any Man in the World.* And that you may ſee, that they are not *aſham'd to pretend to*, and *uſurp ſuch an Antichriſtian Power* (for none but (*r*) Antichriſt ever pretended to it). This Bull of Pope *Paul* the Fourth is referr'd into the (*ſ*) Body of their Canon Law (almoſt One hundred years ago) dedicated to Cardinal *Cajetan*; and *lately* publiſh'd (*t*) again, as a *part of their Law*, without any *Contradiction* (and therefore with the *approbation*) *of the Pope or his Party.* That this their *Opinion of the Papal Power* is far from truth or probability, I have indeavoured to prove before; *& ſic tranſeat cum cæteris erroribus.*

2. As to the ſecond point; *What is Hereſie*, and *who is the Heretick*, who is to be perſecuted with ſuch *fearful Damnations* and *Excommunications*? I ſay in ſhort,

1. That it is agreed amongſt their (*u*) *Caſuiſts*, and (*x*) *Canoniſts*, That *Hereſie is an Error againſt that Faith which they ought to believe, joyned with pertinacy; or it is a pertinacious Error in Points of Faith*; and he who ſo holds ſuch an Opinion, is an Heretick.

2. And

(p) *Hereticorum, Schiſmaticorum corúmque fautorum pœnæ.* That's the Title of the Bull.

(q) *Romanus Pontifex, qui Dei & Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti Vices-gerit in terris, & ſuper Gentes & Regna, plenitudinem Poteſtatis, obtinet, Omnéſque Judicat, à Nemine in Seculo Judicandus, &c.* In Bulla. 19. Paul. 4. Bullarij Rom. Tom. 1. p. 602. Edit. Rom. 1638.

(r) 2. Theſſ. 2. 4.

(ſ) Corpus Juris Canonici per Pet. Matthæum, Francofurti, Ann. 1599. Cap. Cum ex Apoſtolatûs, 9. De Hæret. & Schiſmat. in 7.

(t) In *Corpore* Juris Canonici, Lugduni, 1661.

(u) Hæreſis eſt Error in Fide, Cum Pertinacià. Card. Tolet. Inſtruct. Sacerd. lib. 1. cap. 29. §. 2.

(x) Gratian. Can. *dixit Apoſtolos*, 29. & Can. Qui in Eccleſiâ. 3. Cauſ. 24. Quæſt. 3, & Gloſſa ibidem.

2. *And he is pertinacious*, they ſay, *who holds ſuch an* (y) *Opinion, which he does, or might, and ought to know to be againſt Scripture, or the Church.* By the way; I deſire to be inform'd, *how it is poſſible for their Lay-people and unlearned, to know* (*with any certainty, or aſſurance*) *what Truths are approved, or Errors damn'd in Scripture; when they are* (z) *prohibited* (*under pain of Excommunication*) *ever to read, or have Scripture in any Tongue they underſtand?* Nor are *Bibles* only, in any *Vulgar Tongue prohibited*; but all *Books of Controverſie between Proteſtants and Papiſts*, in any Vulgar Tongue, are (*a*) *equally prohibited.* So that they are *abſolutely deprived* of the *principal means to know Truth and Error*, what *Doctrines are Evangelical*, what *Heretical.*

3. And although they are pleaſed ſometimes to *mention Scripture* in the *Definition of Hereſie*; yet 'tis not *really by them meant.* For (by their receiv'd Principles) a man may hold a *hundred Errors*, which he *Does*, or *Might* and *Ought* to know to be *againſt Scripture* and the *Articles of Faith*, and yet be no *Heretick.* For thus Cardinal *Tolet* tells us—(*b*) *Many Ruſticks or Country Clowns, having Errors againſt the Articles of Faith, are excuſed from Hereſie; becauſe they are Ignorant of thoſe Articles, and are ready to Obey The Church.* And a little before—(*c*) *If any man err in thoſe things he is bound to know; yet ſo, as it is without pertinacy, becauſe he Knows it not to be againſt The Church, and is ready to believe as the Church believes, he is no Heretick.* So that (by their

(y) *Eſt autem pertinacia, quando homo ſcit, aut ſcire debuit & potuit, aliquid eſſe contrarium Scripturæ, aut ab Eccleſiâ damnatum.* Cajetan. ibidem.

(z) Vide Regulas, Indici librorum Prohibit. ex Decreto Conc. Trid. Confecto, præfixas; Reg. 4. & Obſervat. Regulæ dictæ annexam.

(a) *Libri Vulgari Idiomate, de Controverſiis inter Catholicos & Hæreticos noſtri Temporis diſſerentes, non paſſim permittantur; Sed Idem de ipſis ſervetur, quod de Bibliis vulgari linguâ ſcriptis, Statutum eſt.* Ibid. Reg. 6.

(b) *Unde multi Ruſtici, habentes errores contra Articulos fidei, excuſantur ab Hæreſi; Quia Ignorant Articulos, & ſunt Parati Obedire Eccleſiæ, &c.* Card. Toletus Inſtruct. Sacerd. lib. 4. cap. 3. §. 7.

(c) *Siquis erret in his, quæ tenebatur ſcire, tamen ſine pertinaciâ, Quia neſcit eſſe contra Eccleſiam, paratúſque eſt credere, quod tenet Eccleſia, non eſt Hæreticus.* Idem ibidem.

their Principles) let a man believe as many things as he will, contrary to Scripture; yet if he have the Colliers faith, and implicitly believe, as the Church believes, all is well; he is (by them) eſteemed no Heretick.

4. And hence it is, that they have of late, left the word (*d*) *Scripture* out of their *definition* of *Hereſie*; and they only paſs for *Hereticks* at *Rome*, (not who hold *Opinions contrary to Scripture*, but) who *receive not*, or *contradict* what is believed to be *de fide*, by the *Pope and his Party*. And therefore they plainly tell us; That *None can be an Heretick, who believes that Article of our Creed, The Holy Catholick Church* (you may be ſure they mean their own *Popiſh Church*, not only without, but againſt all reaſon) For ſo their (*e*) *Trent-Catechiſm* tells us; not only *in the Text*, but (leaſt we ſhould not *take notice of it*) in the *Margent too*; where they ſay, *Verus. 9. Articuli Profeſſor* (that is, he who will believe what their Church believes) *Nequit dici Hæreticus*. That is, he who believes the *Church of Rome*, to be the *Catholick Church in the Creed*, and that Church *Infallibly aſſiſted by the Holy Ghoſt*, he ſhall not (we may be ſure) be call'd an Heretick at *Rome*. Nay, ſo far are they in Love with their moſt *irrational Hypotheſis*; *That to believe as the Church believes, excuſes their Laicks and the Unlearned from Hereſie*; that they expreſly ſay, *That ſuch men* may in ſome Caſes, (not only *Lawfully, but Meritoriouſly*) believe an *Error contrary to Scripture*, which (in another more knowing Perſon would

(d) *Non enim ut quiſq; primum in fide peccaverit, Hæreticus dicendus eſt. Sed qui Eccleſiæ Authoritate neglectâ, impias opiniones pertinaci animo tuetur.* Catechiſ. Trid. ex Decreto Concilij Tridentini, Juſſu Pij. 5. Edit. Pariſ. 1635. Part. 1. cap. 19. De 9. Symboli Articulo, §. 1. p. 107.

(e) *Fieri igitur non poſſit; ut aliquis ſe Hæreſis Peſte Commaculet, ſi iis fidem adhibeat, quæ in hoc nono fidei Articulo credenda proponuntur.* Catechiſ. Trident. loco dicto.

would be a *real* and *formal Hereſie*. The Caſe is this, (as Cardinal *Tolet* and *Robert Holkott* propoſe it, (*f*) *If a Ruſtick or Ignorant Perſon, concerning Articles of Faith, do believe his Biſhop propoſing ſome Heretical Opinion*, he does *Merit by believing, although it be an Heretical Error*; becauſe he is *Bound* to believe, till it *appear to him to be againſt The Church*. So that in the mean time he is no Heretick. For, 1. He *may lawfully do it*. 2 He is *Bound* to do it, to believe his Biſhop, and the Doctrines propoſed by him. 3. Nay, it is a *Meritorious* action to believe ſuch *Heretical Errors*, though it be contrary to Scripture and the word of our gracious God. This is *ſtrange Doctrine*, yet *publickly* maintain'd by (*g*) their *Caſuiſts* and *Schoolmen*, and *approved by their Church*. For I do not find it *Condemn'd* in any *Index Expurgatorius*, nor (in any *publick declaration*) *diſown'd* by their *Church*; *& quæ non prohibet peccare, aut errare cum poſſit, Jubet*. And here, in relation to the Premiſſes, I ſhall further propoſe two things, and leave them to the Judgment of the Impartial Reader.

(*f*) *Rurſus, ſi Ruſticus circa Articulos Credat ſuo Epiſcopo, proponenti aliquod Dogma Hereticum, in Credendo Meretur, licet ſit Error; quia Tenetur Credere, donec ei Conſtet eſſe contra Eccleſiam.* Tolet. Inſtruct. Sacerd. l. 4. c. 3. §. 7. Idem habet Rob. Holcott, in. 1. Sentent. Quæſt. 1. in Replica. ad 6. Principale: where he tells us, that ſimple people may err in many things, *Dummodo velint Credere ſicut Eccleſia Catholica credit*. And when he puts the caſe in an old ſimple woman, and ſays ——*Si audiat prælatum prædicantem Propoſitionem erroneam, quam ipſa neſcit eſſe erroneam, & ei credit: Non peccat, ſed Tenetur Errare, quia tenetur ei Credere; & Meretur volendo Credere Errorem; & concedo (Inquit) quod ipſa poteſt adipiſci Meritum Debitum Martyri, ſi ipſa Interficitur pro tali Errore, quem credit Articulum fidei, &c.*

(*g*) Eſpecially the Jeſuits; In the end of the *Exercitia Spiritualia Ignatij Loyalæ, Toloſæ*, 1593. there are *Regulæ Servandæ, ut cum Eccleſiâ verè Sentiamus*. The firſt of which is, *Sublato Proprio Omni Judicio, tenendus eſt Paratus Animus ad Obediendum veræ Eccleſiæ*. You may be ſure they mean the Church of *Rome*. The thirteenth Rule is this —— *Si quid quod Oculis noſtris Album apparet Eccleſia Nigrum eſſe definierit, debemus itidem, quod nigrum ſit pronunciare*. And to the ſame purpoſe *Bellarmine* tells us —— *Fides Catholica docet, Omnem virtutem eſſe bonam, & Omne vitium malum. Si autem Papa erraret, præcipiendo vitia & prohibendo virtutes, Tenetur Eccleſia Credere vitia eſſe Bona, & virtutes Malas —— Tenetur credere bonum eſſe quod ille præcipit, & malum quod ille prohibet*. Bellarm. de Rom. Pontif. l. 4. c. 5. §. ultima. Ita etiam V. Erbermannus contra Ameſium, Tom. 1. lib. 3. cap. 6. §. 5. pag. 401. 402.

1. That ſeeing it is their *Received Doctrine*, that an *Implicite Faith* in their *Church*, and a *profeſſion and reſolution* to *believe as ſhe believes*, is enough to *free a Papiſt from Hereſie*, and the *puniſhment* of it: though otherwiſe (through Ignorance) he *hold ſome heretical Errors*, contrary to what his *Church believes*: why may not a Proteſtants Implicite Faith in Scripture, with a Profeſſion and Reſolution to believe every thing in it, as it comes to his knowledge; free him from *Hereſie* and the puniſhment of it; though otherwiſe (in the mean time) he may believe ſome things contrary to Scripture? Certainly, if an *Implicite Faith* in the *Doctrines taught by the Pope* and *his Party*, (for they are the *Roman Church*) with a *reſolution to believe them all*, when they come to *their knowledge*, be ſufficient to free a *Papiſt from Hereſie* and the *Puniſhment* of it; much more, will an *Implicite Faith in the Doctrines taught by our bleſſed Saviour*, and his *Apoſtles* in *Scripture*, with *a Reſolution to believe them all*, when they really come to *their knowledge*, be ſufficient to free a *Proteſtant from Hereſie* and the *puniſhment of it*. Becauſe the Doctrines taught by our bleſſed Saviour and his *Apoſtles are Divine*, and in ſuch a *meaſure and degree* Infallible, as the Doctrines taught by the Pope, and his Party, (without great Error and Impudence) cannot pretend to.

2. Seeing it is their *Received Doctrine* (as may appear by the Premiſſes) that if any Biſhop preach to his People, (the Laity and Unlearned Ruſticks

ſticks) ſome *Heretical Doctrine*, they are bound to believe it, and may not only *Lawfully*, but *Meritoriouſly* do ſo, till it appear that their Church is againſt it. Hence it evidently follows; That if the Biſhop preach'd this Doctrine, *That 'tis lawful to kill an Heretical King, who is actually Anathematiz'd, and Depoſed by the Pope*; they were *bound to believe it*, and might lawfully and *meritoriouſly do ſo*; and then, if it was *meritorious* to *believe ſuch a Doctrine*, then to put it in Execution, and actually *kill ſuch a King*, could *not be unlawful* and vitious. So that we need not wonder, that thoſe *prodigious Popiſh Villains* who were *hired to Aſſaſſinate* our *Gracious King* in the late Conſpiracy, undertook ſuch an Impious Imployment, ſince beſides great ſtore of Gold given to incourage them, their *Religion* and *Learned Caſuiſts* afforded them ſuch Principles (which they were bound to believe) to warrant and *juſtifie their Villany*, ſo that without ſcruple of Conſcience they might do it. In ſhort, they are Hereticks whom *the Pope and his Party are pleaſed to call ſo*; for (by their (*h*) Law and Canons) they are *ſole Judges of the Crime* (what Hereſie is,) and the puniſhment due to it. 'Tis true, when they have *paſſed Sentence* upon *any Heretick*, they deliver him to the *Civil Magiſtrate*; but he is only their *Executioner*, to *hang or burn* according to their Sentence; but has no Power to *reverſe their Sentence*, nor ſo much *as to Examine* whether it be juſt or unjuſt; but (right or wrong) muſt do as they determine.

(h) *Crimen Hæreſis eſt Mere Eccleſiaſticum.* Innocent. 8. Conſtit. 10. §. 2. In Bullario Romano, Romæ, 1638. Tom. 1. p. 337. Col. 1. vide Cap. Ad abolendum, 9. Extra de Hæreticis. *Qui aliter docent quam Eccleſia Romana, Excommunicantur.*

termine. And here (to ſay nothing of the *Impiety and Injuſtice* of the *Roman Church*, in Condemning thoſe they call (or rather miſcall) *Hereticks*; I ſhall take notice of a ſtrange piece of their Hypocriſie, uſed by them, when (after Condemnation) they deliver the Condemned Perſon to the Civil Magiſtrate: when the Biſhop or Inquiſitor who delivers him, thus beſpeaks the Civil Magiſtrate—(*i*) *Sir, We paſſionately deſire you, that for The Love of God, and in reguard of Piety, Mercy, and our Mediation, you would free this miſerable Perſon, from All Danger of Death or mutilation of Members.* And it is there ſaid, that the Biſhop may do this, (*k*) *Effectually and from his Heart.* But notwithſtanding all this *ſeeming Piety* and *Tenderneſs*, when they have Sentenced an Heretick *to death*; they expect and *require the Magiſtrate to Execute* that Sentence, within (*l*) *ſix days*, upon pain of *Excommunication*, *Deprivation*, and *loſs of Authority* and *Offices*. Hence it is, that Pope *Alexander* the Fourth, about the year. 1260. gives Authority to the Inquiſitors, to (*m*) *Compel All Magiſtrates* to Execute their Sentence, (be it what it will). And Pope *Innocent* the Eighth ſays, they muſt neither Examine (*n*) *Nor ſee the Proceſs* againſt thoſe they are *to Execute*. Nor is the matter mended ſince the times of *Innocent* the Eighth, and *Alexander* the Fourth; their Succeſſors are for the ſame *Compulſatory Power*. The Council of *Trent* expreſly ſays—(*o*) *That All Catholick Princes are to be Compelled to obſerve All*

(i) *Domine Judex, rogamus Vos cum Omni affectu, quo poſſumus, ut Amore Dei, Pietatis, & Miſericordiæ Intuitu, & noſtrorum interventu precaminum, miſerimo huic nullum mortis, vel mutilationis periculum Inferatis.* Pontif. Roman. Romæ, 1611. p. 456. & Hoſtienſis in ſummâ. l. 5. De Hæreticis, pag. 424. Edit. Ludg. 1517.

(k) *Pontifex Efficaciter, & ex Corde, Omni Inſtantiâ intercedit, &c.* Ibidem in Rubrica.

(l) *Infra. 6. dies, ſine aliqua Proceſſuum Viſione, Sententias latas promptè exequantur, ſub Excommunicationis pœnâ, aliiſque Cenſuris.* Innocent. 8. Conſtit. 10. In Bullar. Rom. Tom. 1. p. 337.

(m) *Facultas Cogendi Quoſcunque Magiſtratus, ſub pœna Excommunicationis & Interdicti, &c.* Alexand. 4. Conſt. 17. in dicto Bullar. p. 117. Tom. 1. & Conſtit. 18. in Lemmate. Ibid.

(n) *Sine Aliqua Proceſſuum Viſione.* Innocent. 8. dicta Conſtit. 10.

(o) *Cogantur Omnes Principes Catholici Conſervare Omnia Sancita quibus Immunitas Eccleſiaſtica declaratur.* Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 25. De Reformat. c. 20. In Lemmate, Edit. Antverp. 1633.

All the Sanctions and Conſtitutions declaring their Eccleſiaſtical Immunities, amongſt which this of puniſhing Hereticks is not the leaſt, &c. By the Premiſſes (I believe) it may appear, that the Hypocriſie of the *Popiſh Church* is inexcuſable, when ſhe takes God's Name in vain, and prays the Civil Magiſtrate, *For the Love of God, &c.* to do that which ſhe knows (if he were willing) he *neither can* nor *dare do*; nor will *ſhe permit him* to do, having *under pain of Excommunication* (and many *other Penalties*) *abſolutely prohibited him* to do it. I ſay, 'tis not only the *Biſhop* who ſo *intercedes to the Civil Magiſtrate*, but the *Church of Rome* her ſelf, by him. Pope *Innocent* the Third is my warrant for ſaying ſo; who (in a Decretal Epiſtle to the Biſhop of *Paris*) tells us; That *when a Condemn'd Perſon is delivered to the Secular* (p) *Judge, The Church muſt effectually interceed, that he moderate the Sentence ſo,* (which ſhe knows he *neither dare*, nor *by their Law can do*) *that the Condemn'd Perſon may be in no danger of death.* I know that (q) *Roſſenſis,* (& other of the Popiſh Party) do endeavour, with many *little ſhifts*, to *palliate the Hypocriſie* of their Church, but in vain. For *Omnia cum fecit, Thaida, Thais olet.* Sure I am, that (r) *Aquinas*

(p) *Degradatus propter flagitium damnabile & damnoſum, traditur Curiæ ſeculari, pro quo tamen debet Eccleſia efficaciter. Intercedere, ut contra mortis periculum, circa eum ſententia moderetur.* Cap. Novimus. 27. Extra. De verb. ſignificatione.

(q) Roſſenſis cotra Lutherum, ad Art. 33. Operum p. 642. Dixit enim Lutherus, *Eos dicta Orationis formalà non Orare, ſed ludere.*

(r) *Eccleſia Hæreticum Excommunicat, & ulterius relinquit cum Judicio Seculari, à Mundo Exterminandum Per Mortem.* Aquin. 2. 2. Quæſt. 11. Art. 3. Reſpondeo. *Si Judex Eccleſiaſticus tradat Curiæ Seculari hæreticum, non poteſt in aliquo cognoſcere ſecularis; ſcilicet, An Bene vel Male fuerit judicatum, ſed tenetur exequi omninò.* Card. Tuſchus Concluſ. Practicarum Juris. Tom. 4. Lit. H. Concl. 95. §. 4. p. 166. vide Turrecrematam ſumma de Eccleſia. Venet. 1561. part. 2. l. 4. p. 411. where he cites *Wicliff*'s Opinion, *That the Popiſh Biſhops are like the Phariſees, who having ſaid, Non licet nobis quenquam occidere, Chriſtum Seculari poteſtati tradiderunt, erant tamen homicidæ Pilato Graviores.* And when the Gloſs (*verbo deprehenſi. Cap. Excommunicamus*, 15. *Extra de Hæreticis*) made ſome diſtinction of Perſons deliver'd to the Secular Magiſtrate, and that *docentes erant ultimo ſupplicio, officiendi; diſcentes vero decem Libris auri, &c.* There is this Note in the (*b*) Margent——*Hodie nulla eſt talis diſtinctio, nam Magiſtratus Secularis, Quemcunque Hæreticum, ſibi à Judicibus fidei traditum, debet Ultimo Supplicio afficere.* Cap. ut Inquiſitioni de Hæreticis. Lib. 6. (*b*) In Corpore Juris Canon. cum Gloſſis. Pariſ. 1612.

(*Bannes*

(*Bannes* (*ſ*) and others who Comment on that part of *Aquinas*) tells us, *That the Condemn'd Heretick is deliver'd over to the Secular Power, to this very end, that he may be Put to Death, and taken out of the World*; and a great and famous (*t*) *Canoniſt* (*Hoſtienſis*) ſays *expreſly*, what I *have done*; that this *Interceſſion* of their *Church* to the *Secular Magiſtrate*, in behalf of the *Condemned Heretick*, is, (in the Common Opinion) barely *a Colour*, and *verbal* (u) *only*, not *real*. For thus I find him cited in *Panormitan* on the Decretals—*Whatever* (ſays he) *may be ſaid to the contrary*; *yet To this end, is He Delivered to The Secular Power, That He may be puniſhed with death.* Upon theſe Premiſſes, I think it evident, that the *Church of Rome*, in this her *Interceſſion* to the Secular Power, does (with ſtrange *Hypocraſie*) ſeem earneſtly to deſire that of the Magiſtrate, which ſhe knows he dare not do; nay, which *ſhe herſelf*, by her *publick Laws*, has Commanded him not to do. How ſhe will *Anſwer God* (who Infallibly knows all her Hypocriſie) or *her Adverſaries*, objecting it, I know not; *ipſa viderit.* In ſhort; it is (x) confeſs'd, that all thoſe who will not be Inſlaved to *Rome*, and believe as ſhe believes, in *every thing*, are *Hereticks*; and not only ſo, but *damn'd*, and while they continue ſo, and do not *intirely believe their New-Trent-Creed, they are out of all Poſſibility of Salvation.* So their (*y*) Caſuiſts *Eccleſiam Catholicam* (*Romanum Intelligit*) *finiunt vitam, in Ignem Æ- & Angulis ejus paratus eſt.* This is the Charity of *Rome*, to damn all

(*ſ*) Bannes ibidem. Concluſ. 3.

(t) *Sed quicquid dicatur, Ad Hoc ſit iſta Traditio ut Puniatur morte.* Vid. Panormitan. ad Cap. Novimus. 27. Extra. De verb. ſignificat. §. 8.

(u) *Solet Communiter dici, quod iſta Interceſſio eſt Potius Vocalis & Colorata quam Effectualis.* Idem Hoſtienſis, ibidem.

(x) *Omnes qui ab Eccleſiâ Rom. hactenus deſciverant, pro Hæreticis habiti fuerint.* Honorat. Fabri Contra Indifferentes; Dilingæ, 1657. lib. 2. cap. 18. & Mart. Breſſerum. De Conſcientia, lib. 1. cap. 25. pag. 113. 117. 118. *Qui in Uno rejiciunt Authoritatem Eccleſiæ.* pag. 117. Col. 1. Lin. ultima & penultima.

(y) *In Eccleſiâ duntaxat Romana homines ſalvari poſſunt.* Honorat. Fabri, Loco citato. pag. 133. So *Breſſerus* and the reſt of them not only of late, but above five hundred years ago; (yet after the Devil was let looſe, and Antichriſt revealed) For an old Collector of their Canons tells us (*Ivo Cornotenſ. Decret. part. 1. De fide. c. 38.*) *Firmiſſimè tene, & nullatenus dubites, Omnes Paganos, Judæos, Hæreticos & Schiſmaticos, qui Extra æternum ituros, qui diabolo* but themſelves.

per-

perpetually affirm, and their *Trent Council* (in that *Forma Juramenti Profeſſionis Fidei*, in the Bull of Pope *Pius* the Fifth, Extant in the (z) *Conſtitutions of that Council*) requires all their *Eccleſiaſticks*, to *promiſe, vow, and ſwear to believe and maintain it to their death.* For in the end of that Creed, the words are—(a) *This is the Catholick Faith, out of which no man can be ſaved.* And then, they muſt (b) *promiſe, ſwear, and vow to believe and profeſs it, moſt conſtantly as long as they live.* So that although *mens lives* be *exemplary and innocent*, their *Doctrines* which they believe, Ancient and Catholick, yet if they diſſent from *Rome in any one thing*, (and that too upon juſt grounds and evident reaſon) yet they ſhall *be call'd*, and uſed *as Hereticks.* A ſignal Inſtance we have of this in the *Waldenſes* anciently: and becauſe many perhaps, (I ſpeak not of the Learned) may neither know what it is, nor where to find it; I ſhall here crave leave to ſet it down. (c) *Reinerus*, a *Dominican Frier*, an *Inquiſitor*, a *ſevere Perſecutor*, who writ againſt the *Waldenſes*, does (to their great honour, and the ſhame of *Rome*) give them this ſignal Teſtimony. *He tells us of more then Seaventy ancient Hereſies*, moſt of which (he ſays) in his time, were overcome and vaniſhed; *But* (ſays he) *of all the Sects that were, or had been*, (d) *None was ſo pernicious to The Church of* Rome, *as the* Leoniſts, *or* Waldenſes: *and that for three Reaſons.*

(z) Conc. Trid. Antv. 1633. Seſſ. 24. De Reform. p. 152.

(a) Ibid. Hæc eſt Fides Catholica Extra quam, *Nemo Salvus eſſe poteſt.*

(b) *Hanc fidem teneo & profiteor, in Præſenti, & Conſtantiſſimè tenere ad ultimum vitæ ſpiritum ſpondeo, voveo, juro.* Ibid.

(c) Reinerus contra Waldenſes, Cap. 4. in Magna Bibliothecâ Patrum. Pariſ. 1654. Tom. 4. Part. 2. Col. 749. *Sectæ Hæreticorum fuerant plures quam. 70. quæ Omnes deletæ ſunt.* Cap. 4. Reineri.

(d) *Inter Omnes ſectas quæ adhuc ſunt, vel fuerunt, non eſt Perniciosior Eccleſia, quam Leoniſtarum, & hoc tribus de Cauſis.* Ibidem.

(1.) *Prima eſt, quia eſt Diuturnior; aliqui enim dicunt quod duraverit, à tempore Sylveſtri; aliqui, A Tempore Apoſtolorum.*

(2.) *Quia eſt Generalior; Ferè enim nulla eſt Terra, in qua hæc Secta non ſit.* Ibid.cap.4.

(3.) *Tertia, quia Cum Omnes aliæ Sectæ immanitate Blaſphemiarum in Deum, audientibus horrorem inducunt; Hæc Leoniſtarum, Magnam Habet Speciem Pietatis; eo quod coram hominibus Juſtè Vivant; & Bene Omnia De Deo Credant, & Omnes Articulos Qui in Symbolo Continentur.* Ibidem.

(1.) *For the Antiquity and long Continuance of theſe* Waldenſes, *from the time of Pope* Sylveſter (who was made Pope, *Anno Chriſt.* 316.) as ſome ſaid; or (as others) *from the time of the Apoſtles.*

(2.) *For the Generality of that Sect; becauſe there was Scarce any Country where they were not.*

(3.) *When all other Heretick's (by reaſon of their Blaſphemies againſt God) were abhorr'd by thoſe who heard them: The* Waldenſes *had A Great Appearance of Piety; becauſe they Lived Juſtly Before Men; Believ'd All Things well of God, and All the Articles of the Creed.* (The Twelve Articles of their New *Trent* Creed, were neither then believ'd, nor known, no not at *Rome*). Well, if all this be true, (and it is their Enemy, who gives them this ample Teſtimony) what was it, that made this Sect of all others *the moſt pernicious to the Church of Rome?* Certainly, the *Antiquity* or *generality of this Sect*, the *Piety* of their Lives, their *believing all things well of God*, and all *the Articles of the Creed*; none of theſe could be *Pernicious* to any *Truth*, or any *True Church.* What was it then? Why, he tells us, in the next words, that it was (*e*) *only* this; *They Blaſphemed*, (or ſpake ill of) *the Church and Clergy of Rome*; *And* (as he Confeſſes) *The Multitude of the Laity eaſily believed them:* which is an evident Argument, that it was neither *incredible* nor altogether *improbable*, which the *Multitude of the Laiety ſo eaſily believed.* Two things indeed thoſe poor perſecuted *Waldenſes* ſaid, which were very true, and moſt pernicious to th:

(e) *Solummodo Romanam Eccleſiam Blaſphemant, & Clerum; cui Multitudo Laicorum Facilis eſt ad Credendum.* Ibid.

the Church of *Rome*; (for nothing is more pernicious to darkneſs and error then light and truth) 1. They ſaid, *That the* (*f*) *Church of* Rome *was the Whore of* Babylon *in the* Revelation. 2. *That the Pope was the* (g) *Head of all the Errors in that Antichriſtian Church.* And on this Account it was, that the Church of *Rome* did call thoſe poor *Waldenſes Hereticks*, and as ſuch, did (with Fire and Sword and the utmoſt Cruelty) perſecute them. For (as is aforeſaid) he is an Heretick at *Rome* who *contradicts* or *disbelieves* the (*h*) *Canons* and *Conſtitutions of that Church*; although he do not really disbelieve any Divine Truth contain'd in the Canon of Scripture. Now as it was with the poor *Waldenſes*; ſo we are ſure, it has been, is, and will be with all Proteſtants (Princes and People, Supream or Subjects) they are (at *Rome*) declared *Hereticks*, and liable to all the Puniſhments of that, which they are pleas'd to call Hereſie; and (when they have opportunity and ability) thoſe Puniſhments will certainly be Inflicted, without any Pity or Mercy. And this brings me to the third Inquiry, What thoſe Puniſhments are? And here, becauſe the Puniſhments of Hereſie are very many, and very great, it is neither my preſent buſineſs nor purpoſe, particularly to ſet them all down, and explain them; Only I ſhall (in favour to the Ordinary Reader, for to the Learned they are better known) name ſome Authors, where he may find a Diſtinct and full Explication of the

(f) *Eccleſia Romana eſt Meretrix in Apocalypſi.* cap. 17. verſ. 1. 2. &c. Reinerus loco citato. c. 5. De Sectis Modernorum Hæreticorum. Errore. 6. pag. 750.

(g) *Papa eſt Caput Omnium errorum*, &c. Ibid. Errore. 8. they deny'd alſo *Tranſubſtantiation*, *Purgatory*, *Invocation of Saints*, *the Popes Supremacy*. Vide Card. Turrecrematam, in ſumma De Eccleſiâ. Part. 2. Lib. 4. cap. 35. pag. 407. Edit. Venet. 1561.

(h) *Hæreſis eſt, cum quis non ſequutus Doctrinam Chriſti, vel Apoſtolorum, vel Eccleſiæ, Eligit ſibi novam credulitatem.* Card. Tuſchas Concluſ. Juris. Tom. 4. Lit. H. Concl. 91. verbo Hæreſis. p. 164. *Hæreticus eſt, qui aliquid credit, non obſtante quod Eccleſia contrarium decreverit.* Debet enim *Intellectum Captivare Sacræ Scripturæ Sanctæq; Eccleſiæ.* (Cajet. in ſum. verbo Hæreſis.) And by Holy Church you may be ſure they do mean their own Roman Church, for they acknowledge none elſe, but damn all other Chriſtians, as Hereticks.

Nature of Hereſie (according to the Popiſh Principles) and the Number of its Puniſhments. And here,

1. The Gloſs of their Canon Law reduces the Puniſhments of Hereticks to Four Heads, in the General: *Hereticks* (ſays the (*i*) *Gloſſator*) are to be puniſhed either, 1. *By Excommunication.* 2. *Depoſition.* 3. *Loſs of all their Goods.* 4. *By Military Perſecution:* that is, *by Fire and Sword, by War and armed Souldiers.* This is (*k*) approved by ſeveral of their Learned Writers.
2. For the *Body of the Canon Law*, (to paſs by *Gratian* and his *Decretum*) thoſe who have a mind and leaſure, may conſult the Titles *De Hæreticis*, which occur in the (*l*) Decretals of *Greg.* 9. of (*m*) *Bonif.* 8. in the (*n*) *Clementines*, *Extravagantes* (*o*) *Communes* (and in the lately added (*p*) *Seaventh Book of the Decretals*) with the *Gloſſes*, and *Panormitan*'s large Comment upon them.
3. For the Puniſhment of Hereticks by the Civil Laws; they who have a mind to know, may conſult *Juſtinians Code. Lib.* 1. *Tit.* 5. *De Hæreticis & Manichæis*, with the *Gloſs* there. And eſpecially the *Theodoſian Code*, *Lib.* 16. *Tit.* 5. *De Hæreticis*, *Manichæis & Samaritanis*, with the Larger and moſt Learned Notes of *Jacobus Gothofredus*; in the Edition of the *Codex Theodoſianus* at *Lions*, 1665. *Tom.* 6. *pag.* 104. To theſe may be added the Severe Laws of the Emperor (*q*) *Friderick* the Second, made in purſuance of the (*r*) *Lateran Council*; and (though he

(i) *Quadruplex Hæreticorum pœna ſecundum Canones: ſcilicet, Excommunicatio, Depoſitio, Bonorum ablatio, Militaris Perſecutio.* Gloſſ. ad Cap. ad Apoſtol. 2. De Sentent. & re Judicata. In 6. verbo. Hæreſis, In additione. Ita Hoſtienſis in ſumma. Lib. 5. pag. 424. Edit. Lugd. 1517.

(*k*) Reynerius de Piſis, in ſumma De Hæreſi. cap. 4. & F. Reynerus *contra Waldenſes*. cap. 10.

(*l*) Decretal. Greg. 9. Lib. 5. & Tit. 7.

(*m*) De *Hæreticis*. Lib. 5. Tit. 2. In Sexto.

(*n*) Clement. Lib. 5. Tit. 3. De *Hæreticis*.

(*o*) Extrav. Commun. Lib. 5. Tit. 3. De *Hæreticis*.

(*p*) Septimi Decret. Lib. 7. Tit. 3. De Hæreticis & Schiſmaticis. This ſeaventh Book of the Decretals was firſt Printed with the Body of the Canon Law, (dedicated to Card. *Cajetan*) at *Franckfurt*. 1590. and ſince at *Lions*, *Anno* 1661.

(*q*) Leges Frider. 2. extant in Corpore Jur. Civilis cum Gloſſ. Lugd. 1618. in Calce lib. 2. Feudorum. Tom. 5. pag. 137. 138. &c.

(*r*) Conc. Laterani ſub Innocent. 3. Ann. 1215. & præcipuè Canonis. 3. De Hæreticis.

he had little reaſon for it) to gratifie the Pope in his barbarous deſigns to ruin all thoſe he call'd (generally miſcall'd) *Hereticks: which Laws* (as we may be ſure they would) the (*f*) Pope and his Party did highly approve. And have referr'd them into the Body of their Canon Law. 7. *Decretalium. Lib.* 5. *Tit.* 3. *Capp.* 1. 2. *In Edit. Corporis Juris Can. Lugduni, Anno* 1661.

4. And for a full and particular Explication of thoſe Laws, and the Quality of the Puniſhments of Hereticks Inflicted by them, their Caſuiſts and Canoniſts may be conſulted: Amongſt many others, ſuch as theſe; (*t*) *Filliucius*, (*u*) *Durantus*, (*x*) *Antonius Archiepiſcopus Florentinus*, (*y*) *Azorius*, *Paul* (*z*) *Layman*, (*a*) *Raynerius*, *Johan de* (*b*) *Turrecremata*, Cardinal (*c*) *Hoſtienſis*, and *Antonius Auguſtinus Archiepiſcopus Terraconenſis* (a moſt Learned Canoniſt, and a very uſeful Book) has given us a Catalogue of their (*d*) Canons *De pœnis quæ ſunt Hæreticis Conſtitutæ*. In ſhort, whoever has a mind, opportunity and ability to Conſult the aforemention'd Authors, (or ſuch others) may eaſily find the Number and Nature of thoſe Puniſhments, which (by their Impious Papal Canons and Conſtitutions) are to be Inflicted on thoſe (better Chriſtians then themſelves) they are pleaſed to call Hereticks.

(*f*) *Nos Honorius, Servus Servorum Dei, has leges à Friderico, pro utilitate Omnium Chriſtianorum* (pro Pernicie Waldenſium) *Editas, Laudamus, Approbamus, & Confirmamus, tanquam In Æternum valituras. Ita Honorius Papa.* 3. *in Calce dictarum Legum.*

(*t*) Moral. Quæſt. Tract. 32. cap. 7. *De Pœnis Hæreticorum.*

(*u*) Speculi. Lib. 4. part. 4. *De Hæreticis.*

(*x*) Summæ. part. 2. Tit. 12. Cap. 4. *De Hæreſi. & Hæreticorum Pœnis.*

(*y*) Inſtit. Moral. Tom. 1. Lib. 8. Capp. 10. 11. 12.

(*z*) Theol. Moral. Lib. 2. Tract. 1. c. 16. p. 202.

(*a*) Summæ. Tom. 1. De Hæreſi. p. 1017. Venet. 1585.

(*b*) Summæ de Eccleſiæ. part. 2. Lib. 4. cap. 1. &c.

(*c*) Hoſtienſis in ſummæ. Lib. 5. De Hæreticis. p. 422. Edit. Lugd. 1517.

(*d*) Epitome Juris Pontificij Veteris. Lib. 34. Tit. 3. & lib. 38. & lib. 11. Tit. 53. part. 1. & 2. &c.

10. Concerning this Impious Bull, containing the Damnation (as he calls it) and Excommunication

Obſerv. 10.

cation of Queen *Elizabeth*, by Pope *Pius* the Fifth; it is further to be observed, That it is no new thing. For Queen *Elizabeth* was actually Excommunicate before, 1. In their famous (*e*) *Bulla Cœnæ Domini* (take *famous* in which sense you will, the worst is good enough) wherein they do (at *Rome*) *Anathematize* and (*f*) *Curse* all *Protestants* (both Kings and Subjects, Princes and Common People) It is called *Bulla Cœnæ Domini*, because it is published every year on *Maundy Thursday*, the Day in which our blessed Saviour Instituted (*Cœnam Domini*) the Sacrament of his last Supper. And here, (by the way) we may observe the difference *between Christ*, and (his pretended Vicar) Antichrist. 1. On that Day our blessed Saviour Institutes that Sacrament, as a blessing and seal of the mutual Love between him and his Church, and of the Communion and Charity of Christians amongst themselves; but the Pope (far otherwise and unlike him, whose Vicar he pretends to be) on the very same Day, (without and against Christian Charity) Anathematizes and Curses the greatest part of Christians. 2. Our blessed Saviour was that Day ready *to Dye* for the Salvation of *Sinners*; but his pretended Vicar is ready, (on the same Day) and (so far as he is able) does *actually Damn* the greatest part of the Christian World, and has been drunk with the blood of the Saints. 3. Nor did Queen *Elizabeth* stand Accursed (before *Pius* the Fifth's Excommunication of her) only in that *Bulla Cœnæ*, but in several other Papal Bulls. I shall only name one;

(*e*) Vide Constit. 63. Paul. 5. In Bull. Romano. Rom. 1638. Tom. 3. pag. 183. *Ubi Omnes Istiusmodi Bullæ, quæ dicto Bullario occurrunt Notantur.*

(f) *Anathematizamus Quoscunque Hussitas, Wickliffistas, Lutheranos, Suinglianos, Calvinistas, Hugonottos.* §. 1. dictæ Bullæ.

one; and (becauſe it is of ſignal Conſequence, and to our preſent purpoſe) give ſome ſhort Account of the Contents of it. The Bull I mean, is that of Pope (*g*) *Paul* the Fourth, next Predeceſſor, (ſave one) to *Pius* the Fifth, and is (*h*) dated eleven years before that of Pope *Pius* the Fifth. Now concerning this Bull, I obſerve

1. That it was no *raſh Act* of that Pope, but (if he ſay true) made with (*i*) *Mature deliberation*, by the *Counſel and unanimous Conſent of himſelf and the Cardinals.*
2. And it is further (*k*) *Confirmed* by his Succeſſor *Pius* the Fifth, *who Approves and Commands it to be Inviolably kept and obſerved.* Nor is this all; but (that we may ſee how ſuch Doctrine is approved at *Rome*). This Bull of *Paul* the Fourth, and that of *Pius* the Fifth, which ſo fairly confirms it, are now both of them referr'd into the *Body of their* (l) Canon Law.

Now in this Bull of Pope *Paul* the Fourth, thus confirm'd, approved, and received into the Body of *their Law*;

1. *He does* (*m*) *Approve, Innovate, and Confirm All the Cenſures and Puniſhments due to Hereticks and Schiſmaticks, by any Conſtitution of any former Pope, or thoſe who were Reputed Popes, Howſoever thoſe Conſtitutions were made and promulgated, and Commands them to be kept in freſh Memory, and perpetually Obſerved.*

(*g*) Vid. Paul. 4. Conſtit. 19. In dicto Bullar. Tom. 1. p. 602.

(*h*) Bulla Paul. 4. data Romæ, 15. Cal. Mart. Ann. 1559. Bulla autem Pij. 5. data Rom. 5. Cal. Maij. 1570. Eliz. 13. In dicto Bullario. Tom. 2. p. 229.

(i) *Habita deliberatione Maturâ, de Cardinalium Conſiliis & unanimi aſſenſu.* Bullæ dictæ. §. 2.

(k) *Bullam Paul. 4. &c. Renovamus Confirmamus, illámque Inviolabiliter, & Ad Unguem Obſervari volumus & Mandamus.* Conſtit. Pij. 5. 22. §. 3. dicti Bullar. Tom. 2. p. 151.

(*l*) Vid. Cap. 9. 10. Decret. 7. De Hæreticis & Schiſmaticis. In Corpore Juris Canon. Ludg. 1661.

(m) *Omnes & ſingulas Excommunicationis, Privationis, &c. & Quaſvis alias Cenſuras & Pœnas à Quibuſvis Rom. Pont. aut Pro Talibus Habitis, in Conſtitut. contra Hæreticos Quomodolibet Latis, Approbamus, Innovamus, ac Perpetuo obſervari, ac in Viridi Obſervantia eſſe debere decernimus.* §. 2.

2. *And*

2. *And then he* (n) *declares* (with as little Charity as Infallibility) *that All Hereticks which are, or For the Future shall be, do Incurr All these Censures and Punishments, and 'tis his expres Will and Decree they should do so.* And that we may not mistake his meaning, as if All those Censures and Punishments were by him Inflicted and Denounced only upon and against some Inferior Persons and Hereticks; he does seaven or eight times expresly name *Counts, Barons, Marquesses, Dukes, Kings and Emperors:* And further says; *That as Heresie and Schism in them is more Pernicious to others, so ought their Punishment to be more severe*; and then (*by his Constitution, which he declares to be* (o) *perpetually and for ever Obligatory, he actually and totally* (p) *Deprives them of their Counties, Baronies, Marquisats, Dukedoms, Kingdoms and Empires,* and leaves them *to the Secular Power,* to (*q*) *receive Due Punishment,* that is, *Death*; as is evident by the Consequents in that Constitution). Nor is this all; He damns them to an (*r*) *Incapacity* and *Perpetual Inability* of being *restored to their Honours or Possessions*; No, not if they *seriously and truly repent*, and become good Catholicks. For in that case of their true Repentance and forsaking their Heresie, they shall save their Lives; yet they must be (*s*) *Cast into Perpetual Prison, and there be fed with Bread of Sorrow, and Water of Sadness, and to have no Comfort or Humanity shew'd them by any, no not by Kings*

(n) *Necnon Quoscunq; qui hactenus à fide Catholicâ deviasse, aut in Schisma aut Hæresin incidisse deprehensi sint, seu in Posterum incident, cujuscunq; Conditionis, Gradus, seu Præeminentiæ existunt, etiamsi Baronali, Ducali, Regali, & Imperiali excellentia prosulgeant, & eorum Quemlibet, Censuras Pœnas prædictas incurrere Volumus ac Decernimus.* Ibidem. §. 2.

(o) *Hac nostra Constitutione in Perpetuum Valiturâ, sancimus, statuimus, definimus, &c.* §. 3.

(p) *Comitatibus, Baroniis, Marchionatibus, Ducalibus, Regnis & Imperiis penitus, &, in Totum Perpetuo Privati sint, &c.* Ibidem.

(q) *Seculares relinquantur arbitrio Potestatis, animadversione Debita puniendi, habentúrque Pro Relapsis.* Ibid. §. 3.

(r) *Ad illa de Cetero sint Inhabiles & Incapaces; nec Restitui aut Rehabilitari Possint.* Ibidem.

(s) *Apparentibus verè Pœnitentiæ Judiciis & Condignis fructibus, in loco aliquo Regulari, ad Peragendum Perpetuam in Pane Doloris & Aqua Mœstitiæ pœnitentiam, Detrudendi sunt — & evitari Omnique Humanitatis Solatio destitui debent.* Ibid.

Kings or Emperors. And though this be the height of Impious and *Antichriſtian Tyranny*, yet (*t*) it muſt be Imputed (as he tells us) to the Popes *Clemency and Benignity.* By the Premiſſes it may evidently appear, That Queen *Elizabeth* was (by many Papal Bulls and Damnatory Conſtitutions) actually Excommunicate, before this Bull of *Pius* the Fifth. I deſire then to know, Whether thoſe Anathema's of former Popes, (which they Declared and Commanded to be in force againſt all Hereticks *For ever*, and *Perpetually* Obligatory) were *valid* and did Actually and (as they Intended) *Effectually Exclude that Queen out of their Church*, or not? If not; then 'tis certain, the Pope has not that Supream Power he pretends to. For when ſo many Popes, in their Damnatory Bulls, (and that *Ex Plenitudine Poteſtatis Apoſtolicæ*) declare the Queen, and all ſuch Hereticks, Excommunicate, and (as their Phraſe is) *cut* (u) *off from the Unity of the Body of Chriſt*, and Eternally damned: If this be not Effectually done, then all thoſe Bulls are *Bruta Fulmina*, Inefficacious, Null and Inſignificant. But if thoſe Anathema's and Excommunications of former Popes, were valid, and the Queen by them, Actually put out of the Church, (as will, I ſuppoſe, and muſt (by them) be granted) then *Pius* the Fifth his Excommunication is a nullity, and indeed a ridiculous Impoſſibility. It being impoſſible, he ſhould take from her, what ſhe had not; and deprive her (by any Excommunication) of that

(t) *Ex Ipſius Sanctæ Sedis Benignitate & Clementia.* Ibid. §. 3. N. Eymericus Directorio Inquiſitorum, part. 3. pag. 516. Col. 1.

(u) *Eſſéque à Chriſti Corporis unitate præciſum.* In Bulla Pij. 5. §. 3. & *Paul* the Third in his Damnation of *Hen.* 8. and all his Adherents, ſays, *Eóſque Anathematis, Maledictionis, & Damnationis Æternæ Mucrone Percutimus.* Bulla Paul. 3. 7. §. 7. In Bullario Rom. Tom. 1. p. 515. Col. 2. Edit. Romæ, 1638.

Eccleſiaſtical Communion, of which ſhe ſtood Actually deprived before by his Predeceſſors; eſpecially by Pope *Paul* the Third, who Excommunicates and Curſes not only *Henry* the Eighth, but *particularly all* (x) *his Children, Male and Female, born or to be born of* Ann Bolen (Mother of Queen *Elizabeth*) *declares them deprived of all Power and Dominion, and of all their Goods and Patrimony, and Incapable of reſtitution to that Power and Patrimony, and of Acquiſition of any other for the future.* And that we ſhould not doubt, that this was the Popes meaning, they have added a Marginal Note to that Bull in the Roman Edition, which tells us; (y) *That the Pope* (in that Bull) *did deprive the Children of* Henry *the Eighth, and his Adherents, of All their Goods and Dignities, and declared them Incapable of any other for the future.*

By the Premiſſes, I think it may be, and is Evident, that Queen *Elizabeth* (by moſt Papal Bulls and Conſtitutions) ſtood Actually Excommunicate and Depos'd before this Bull of *Pius* the Fifth. Sure I am, the Popiſh Party never own'd her as their lawful Sovereign, but call'd her an Uſurper of the Crown, to which (as a Declared and Excommunicate Heretick) ſhe had no right at all. And it ſeems, Pope *Pius* himſelf was of the ſame Opinion. For in this very Bull, he ſpeaks of her only as (z) *Pretended* Queen; and of her (a) *Pretended right to the Crown.* And hence we may with Reaſon and good Logick Infer, That when *Pius* the Fifth in this his Bull *Excommunicates* and *Depo-*

(x) *Henrici Regis ex dicta Anna natos & naſcituros, aliósque deſcendentes, uſque ad gradum in Jure Conſtitutum, nulla ætatis aut ſexus ratione habitâ, dignitatibus, Dominiis, &c. Privamus, & ad Similia obtinenda Inhabilitamus.* Ibid. dictæ Bullæ. §. 9.

(y) *Filiósque eorum de dignitatibus, Dominiis, &c. & bonis Omnibus Privatos, & Ad Alia de Cætero Obtinenda Inhabiles eſſe declarat.* Ibid. in Margine.

(z) *Elizabetha Prætenſa Angliæ Regina.* Bullæ Pij. 5. §. 1.

(a) *Ipſam Prætenſo Regni Jure privatam.* Ibidem. §. 4

ſes her; he does (notwithſtanding his Plenitude of Power and Infallibility) ridiculouſly undertake (what he could not do) an Impoſſibility. For as it is impoſſible to turn *Sempronius* out of a Houſe in which he never was; or deprive him of a Dominion which he never had, (turning out of a Houſe, neceſſarily preſuppoſing his being in it, and deprivation preſuppoſing Right and Poſſeſſion) ſo it is a like Impoſſibility for the Pope, by any Excommunication, to turn the Queen out of the Communion of the Popiſh Church, in which ſhe never was; (being born, baptiz'd and always bred in the Proteſtant Church and Religion) or deprive her of thoſe Dignities and Dominions, which (according to their own (*b*) Principles) ſhe never had any right to, nor ever could have any; being (by their Law, and many Papal Anathema's and Decretals) utterly diſabled, and made incapable of any ſuch Dominions or Dignities.

(*b*) It is a Reſolved Caſe in the Canon Law, (and Pope *Gelaſius* is the Caſuiſt who Reſolves it) *Quicúnque in Hæreſin ſemel damnatam labitur, ejus damnatione ſeipſum involuit*: Or (as it is in the *Lemma* prefix'd to that Canon) *Ejus Damnationis participem ſe facit*. Vid. Can. Achatius. 1. Cauſ. 24. Quæſt. 1. And Can. Majores. 2. Idem Gelaſius eodem modo Statuit. And Pope *Felix* ſays, *Non ultra in eum procedere oportet, qui in hæreſin damnatam incidit*. Ibid. Can. Achatius. 3.

Obſerv. 11.

11. It is evident that the Pope in this Impious Bull, does (by his uſurp'd Antichriſtian Power) Depoſe and Deprive Queen *Elizabeth* of all her Royal Authority, Dominion and Dignity, and ſo puts her into the Condition of a poor private Perſon, without any Power or Juriſdiction over all, or any of her Subjects. Whence theſe damnable Doctrines and Impious Concluſions evidently follow,

1. That if any Jeſuit, any Villanous *Raviliac*, or through pac'd Papiſt had kill'd, or with Poyſon or Piſtol had taken away her Life, (as they often

Indeavor'd) it had been no Treaſon. For all know, that Treaſon is *Crimen* (c) *Majeſtatis*, or *Læſa Majeſtas*; a Crime againſt Sacred Majeſty; either Immediately, againſt the Perſon, or Perſons in whom Majeſty reſides; or mediately againſt thoſe who are his nearer Repreſentatives, as the Lord Chancellor, Treaſurer and the Judges, when they are in Execution of their Office. And though there be an Inferior Degree of Treaſon, (as of a Servant againſt his Lord and Maſter, a Wife againſt her Husband) yet no Treaſon ever was (either by the Imperial and Civil, or our National and Common Laws) but againſt a Superior. And therefore the Queen being depoſed by the Pope as an Heretick, and actually deprived, not only of all her Royal Power and Majeſty, but of all Juriſdiction and Superiority over her Subjects (and they abſolved from their Oaths of Allegiance and Fidelity) and ſo a private Perſon only, without any Power to command Obedience. I ſay, upon theſe Impious Popiſh Principles, to kill the Queen could not poſſibly have had the Nature or Name of Treaſon. Had they by open War, or privately by Poyſon or Piſtols, taken away her life (as they Intended, and often Indeavor'd, as we ſhall ſee anon) they might have been Murderers, but not Traitors. So that the Pope and his Party believing that the Queen was Actually depoſed and deprived of all her Royal Dignity and Dominion, as a Heretick; they muſt conſequently be-

(c) Vid. Juſtinianum F. ad Leg. Juliam Majeſtatis; & Statut. 25. Edvardi. 3. c. 2. in the Statute of Purveyors, Anno Domini. 1350.

believe, that the Murdering of her, by any of her former Subjects, neither was, nor could be Treaſon. But this is not all, For

2. Admit ſhe had not been depoſed, by any Papal Law, Bull or Decretal Conſtitution; yet any of their Popiſh Clergy might have murder'd her, and been no way guilty of Treaſon, though they were Engliſh men, and born her Subjects; nay, though they had actually taken the Oaths of Allegiance before they took Popiſh Orders. The reaſon of this is evident, and a neceſſary Conſequent, from their Impious and Rebellious Principles. For they ſay, *That the Clergy* (d) *Are no Subjects of any Prince*; *and therefore they themſelves conclude* (*as well they may*) *that if they Rebel and ſeek the Ruin of their Prince, yet* (*in them*) *it is no Treaſon.* This *Emanuel Sa*, the Jeſuit expreſly tells us, in a Book (not ſurreptitiouſly ſent into the World, but) publiſh'd with his (e) *Name* to it, *Dedicated* to the *Virgin* (f) *Mary*, *approved*, *highly Commended*, and *Licenc'd by* (g) *Publick Authority.* Thus is this Rebellious Doctrine approved, not only by the *Librorum Cenſor* at *Antverp*; but in Heaven too; at leaſt in the Opinion of the Author, who otherwiſe would not have dedicated it to the Virgin *Mary*, and deſired her Patronage, and Promotion of it, for the good of Souls. Sure I am, I do not find it Condemn'd in any of their *Indices Expurgatorij* (neither in the (h) *Spaniſh Index*, nor that of (i) *Portugal*, nor that of Pope (k) *Alexander* the Seaventh at *Rome*,

(d) *Clerici Rebellio in Regem non eſt Crimen Læſæ Majeſtatis, quia non eſt Subditus Regi.* Eman. Sa Aphoriſ. Confeſſ. verbo Clericus. p.41.

(e) Colon. 1599.

(f) *Ad Beatiſſ. Dei Matrem. Accipe* (*Sapientiæ Divinæ Sacrarium*) *Libellum hunc; tuoque Præſidio ſic tuère & promove, ut ad Multorum proficiat æternam Salutem.* Ibid. pag.2.

(g) *Hi Aphoriſmi Docti ſunt & Pij, Multámque utilitatem alaturi Confeſſariis Omnibus.* Ibid.pag. 384.Sylveſter Pardo.Eccleſ.Antverp. Canonicas Librorumque Cenſor.

(h) Index Librorum Prohibit. Noviſſimus, Madriti.1667.Eman. Sa non Omnino meminit.

(i) Index Librorum Prohibit.Olyſipone. An. 1624.p.543.

(k) Index Librorum Prohibit. Alexandr. 7. Romæ,1667. pag.41.

Rome, &c. Nay, ſo far are the Inquiſitors from Condemning this Rebellious Doctrine of *Emanuel Sa*, that the *Spaniſh Index* does not ſo much as name, much leſs cenſure him or his *Aphoriſms*. But the (*l*) *Portugal Index*, (in which both the Author and his Aphoriſms are expreſly nam'd) cenſures only two Propoſitions (one about *Pennance*, the other about *Extream Unction*) which the *Inquiſitors* (the *Supream* (m) *Congregation of them at* Rome) *would have left out; and then approved and permitted all the reſt.* And ſo that Erroneous and Impious Aphoriſm, *That Clergy-men are not Subjects of Kings, and therefore not Capable of Committing Treaſon, although they actually Rebel againſt and Murder them.* But the late Index of Pope *Alexander* the Seaventh, ſpeaks more fully and home to our preſent purpoſe, and expreſly, *permits*, and *approves* (for we may be ſure they will not permit what they do not approve) all *Editions of thoſe* (n) *Aphoriſms*, (*Even at* Rome) *before the year* 1602. In all which this Rebellious Aphoriſm, we are ſpeaking of, was, and ſo was approved by them. This does further and (if that be poſſible) more evidently appear out of theſe their Approved and Authentick Expurgatory Indices, wherein this Propoſition—(*Prieſts Are By The Law of God Subject to Princes*) is damn'd as Erroneous and Heretical, both in the (*o*) *Spaniſh Index*, and that of (*p*) *Portugal*. For the Inquiſitors finding it in the (*q*) *Index* of *Chryſoſtom*, Command it to be expunged and blotted

(*l*) Loco dicto.

(m) *Ii Aphoriſmorum Codices deinceps permittuntur, à quibus Expunctæ ſunt duæ Sententiæ, quas Ann.* 1611. *pridie Calend. Mart. Cavendas Reſcripſit, Sanctæ & univerſalis Inquiſitionis Congregatio, per Illuſtriſſ. Card. Arragonium.* Index Olyſipone. 1624. loco dicto.

(n) *Emanuelis Sa Aphoriſmi Confeſſariorum Hactenus Impreſſi, etiam Romæ, ante Ann.* 1602. *poſt autem tale Tempus Romæ Editi de mandato Magiſtri Sacri Palatij Permittuntur.* Index Alexandri. 7. loco dicto.

(o) *Ex Indice Joh. Chryſoſtom. Baſil.* 1558. *Dele ſequentia.* And then (amongſt many other evident truths) this Propoſition follows; *Sacerdotes Etiam Principibus Jure Divino Subditi.* This muſt be Expunged. Index Libr. Prohib. Madriti. 1667. pag. 703. Col. 1.

(*p*) And the Index of *Portugal*, Edit. Olyſipone, Ann. 1624. p. 753. Col. 1. damns the very ſame Poſition.

(*q*) In Indice Operum Chryſoſtom. Baſil. 1558. ex Officina Frobeniana.

ted out; Although *Chryſoſtom* (in the Text) ſays the very ſame thing. Hence it evidently follows; That if this Propoſition (*Prieſts (by the Law of God) Are Subject to Princes*) be erroneous and falſe, as the Pope and his Party ſay it is, (their Inquiſitors Commanding it to be Expung'd, as Erroneous) then the Contradictory (*Prieſts Are not by The Law of God Subject to Princes*) muſt of neceſſity be true, and by them approved and believed. Unleſs they will ſay, (which were highly irrational and ridiculous) that Contradictory Propoſitions may be both falſe, and they believe neither of them. But this they neither do, nor will ſay; for their greateſt Writers publickly ſay, and Indeavour to prove, *That Prieſts Are not Subject to Princes.* Nay, (r) Cardinal *Cajetan* expreſly ſays, *That the Clergy are ſo Sacred, that 'tis Impoſſible they ſhould be Subject to Princes.* When he ſays, *It is impoſſible*, his meaning is, that 'tis (not *naturally*, but) *morally* impoſſible; becauſe if any Prince ſhould uſe his Prieſts and Clergy as Subjects, it were a great Sin, and (in his Opinion) Sacriledge; and therefore Impoſſible: Becauſe, according to the Rule of Law, *Illud ſolum Poſſumus quod Jure Poſſumus.* So we have that great Roman Cardinal expreſly approving that Rebellious Doctrine, *That Prieſts are not Subject to Princes.* Nor (we may be ſure) was it any private or ſingular Opinion of his, which died with him; For when (ſ) afterwards, *Emanuel Sa's* Aphoriſms (wherein the ſame

(r) *Perſona Cujuſlibet Clerici eſt Sancta quoad hoc, quod Non Poteſt Subjici Poteſtati Seculari.* Cajetan. in. 2.2. Quæſt. 99. §. Ad Quintum Dubium mihi. p. 247. Col. 3.4.

(ſ) R. Patris Emanuelis Sa Aphoriſmi Confeſſariorum. Coloniæ 1599.

ſame Doctrine was maintained) were publiſh'd, as a (t) Work *Profitable* and *Neceſſary* for Divines, and *All who had Cure of Souls.* An Advocate of the Parliament of *Paris* (eminent for Law and Learning) tells us two Things: 1. *That thoſe Aphoriſms were Approved at* (u) Rome. 2. And then paſſes a juſt Cenſure upon them —(x) *That ſuch Doctrine was the Plague and Ruin of Commonwealths: Royal and Supream Powers being the Ordinance of God, by which All Men are made Subject to the Juriſdiction of Kings*; So that Learned Perſon. And (to paſs by all others) an Excellent Perſon) of great Judgment and Integrity, and a *Roman Catholick*, (I mean Father (y) *Paul* of *Venice*) tells us; that in the *Quarrels* between Pope *Paul* the Fifth, and the *Venetians*, a World of Books were writ (by Jeſuits and others) to vindicate the Popes Cauſe, and they (z) *All Agreed in this, That the Clergy were Exempt from all Secular Juriſdiction, & quoad Perſonas & Bona; Secular Princes had nothing to do with their Perſons or Purſes; nor were They Subjects to Princes, no not in Caſes of High Treaſon.* Nor was this Rebellious Doctrine maintained only by the Popes Party and Paraſites; but the Pope himſelf (whom the Jeſuits and Canoniſts miſcall *Infallible*) approves and juſtifies it; and in *Decemb.* 1605. tells the *Venetian Ambaſſador, That* (a) *Eccleſiaſticks were not Comprehended in* tells us —— *Clerici non pertinent ad Regis Juriſdictionem.* Conſiderat. pag. 137. Edit. Ingolſtadij, Ann. 1607. And there (beſides *Bellarmine* us a Liſt of Thirteen or Fourteen Authors, who writ for the Pope in *Venetians*, of the ſame Opinion. Gretſer Ibid. p. 380.

(t) *Opuſculum Theologis Omnioſque animarum Curam habentibus Utile ac Neceſſarium.* Ibid. in Libri dicti Ἐπιγραφῆ.

(u) Vide Librum cum hac Ἐπιγραφῆ, Les Oevures de Maiſtre *Jacques* Leſchaſier, &c. Pariſ. 1652. p. 421. *Libellus Aphoriſmorum Romæ Probatus.*

(x) *Quæ Doctrina* (that the Clergy are not Subjects to Princes) *eſt peſtis & everſio Rerum publicarum —— Regia poteſtas vel ſuprema nihil aliud eſt, quam Conſtitutio Dei, quæ Omnes Mortales Juriſdictioni Regum ſubjiciuntur.* Ibidem.

(y) Vide Hiſtoriam Interdict Veneti, per P. Sarpium, 1626. Edit. Latina.

(z) *Omnes, in eo Concordes aſſerebant, Clericos Non eſſe Principi Subditos, ne in Crimine quidem Læſæ Majeſtatis.* pag. 107. dictæ Hiſtoriæ & pag. 13.

(a) *Eccleſiaſticos non Comprehendi inter Subditos Principis, nec ab eo poſſe pœnis affici, etſi Rebelles eſſent.* They are the words of Pope *Paul* the fifth to the Venetian Ambaſſador, in *Decemb.* 1605. in the aforeſaid Hiſtory, pag. 13. *Gretſer* ad Theolog. Venetos. l. 2. and *Baronius*) he gives his Quarrel with the

the

the number of A Princes Subjects, nor could be Puniſhed By him, though they were Rebels. A hundred ſuch Paſſages (out of their School-men, Canoniſts, Caſuiſts, (eſpecially the Jeſuites) and their Canon Law) might eaſily be quoted; but theſe, to Impartial and Intelligent Perſons, will be ſufficient to Evince, That the Pope and his Party do publickly and expreſly maintain this Rebellious Doctrine, and (when it makes for their Catholick Cauſe, and they have Opportunity and Ability to put it in Execution) do alſo practiſe it. The Sum of which Damnable Doctrine (repugnant to the clear Principles of Nature and Scripture, and all Religions, ſave that of *Rome*) is this; If any King be Excommunicate and Depoſed by the Pope, then any of his Subjects, Clergy or Laity, (*horreſco referens*) may take Arms and Rebel againſt him, or Murder him, and yet (by this Impious Popiſh Doctrine) be neither Rebels nor Traitors: And if their King be neither Excommunicate nor Depoſed, but ſtands *rectus in Curia Romanâ*, and be (as they call it) a good Catholick; yet if any of his Eccleſiaſticks (Secular or Regular) Rebel or Murder him, it can be no Treaſon or Rebellion in them; ſeeing (according to their Principles) they are none of his *Subjects*, nor he their *Superior*; and Treaſon or Rebellion againſt an Equal or Inferior, is (in propriety of Law) impoſſible. But this is not all. For;

3. Let it be granted, (which is both Impious and Evidently untrue) That any Popiſh Aſſaſſin or Roman *Raviliac*, had not been Guilty of any Treaſon, if he had kill'd the Queen, after the Pope had Depoſed her, as a Heretick; yet ſure, they muſt grant that it was Murder, and an Impious Act, to kill a Perſon over whom he had no Juriſdiction. No; this they deny: the approved and received Principles of the Popiſh Church acquit ſuch Prodigious Villains not only from Rebellion and Treaſon, but from *Murder* too. He who had kill'd the Queen, after Excommunication and Depoſition by the Pope, had been *no Traitor*, nor (which is leſs) ſo much as a *Murderer*. We are told in the Body of their Canon Law—(b) *That they are no Murderers, who (out of Zeal to the Church) take Arms againſt Excommunicate Perſons.* So the Title prefix'd to the Canon cited in the Margent; and the Text of the Canon ſays further; *Thoſe Souldiers ſo armed,* (c) *Are not Murderers, if out of a burning Zeal to their Catholick Mother* (the Church of *Rome* he means) *they Kill any of ſuch Excommunicate Hereticks:* Thus the Caſe is deliberately determin'd by their Supream Infallible Judge, Pope *Urban* the Second, a little befor the (d) end of the Eleventh Century; and about Twenty years after (by *Ivo Carnotenſis*) referred into a (e) Collection of the Roman Canons: And *Gratian* (about Forty years after *Ivo*) Regiſters it in his *Decretum*, which Pope (f) *Gregory* the Thirteenth approves and con-

(b) *Non ſunt Homicidæ, qui adverſus Excommunicatos Zelo Matris Eccleſiæ, armantur.* Ita Lemma præfixum Can. Excommunicatorum. 47. Cauſ. 23. Quæſt. 5. vide Lemma hujus Can. apud Juonem. Decreti part. 10. cap. 54.

(c) *Non eos Homicidas Arbitramur, quos adverſus Excommunicatos, Zelo Catholicæ Matris ardentes, aliquos eorum Trucidaſſe contigerit.* Ibid. in Canone.

(d) Ivo Carnotenſis Epiſcopus; Decret. part. 10. cap. 54.

(e) Moritur Urban. 2. Anno Chriſt. 1099.

(f) Vide Bullam Gregor. 13. dat. Romæ, 1. Jul. 1580. Corpori Juris Canonici præfixam.

confirms for Law; and ſo it ſtands confirm'd, and received for Law, (*g*) in their laſt and beſt Editions of that Law, ever ſince. Whence it may (and does) appear, that this Impious and Rebellious Doctrine, (*That Killing Kings or Queens Excommunicate by the Pope, was no Murder*) has been approved at *Rome* (ſince (*h*) the Devil was let looſe, and Antichriſt appeared) above Six hundred years.

I know that honeſt Father (*i*) *Caron* (not ſo diſloyal as moſt of his Party) indeavours to mollifie this Rebellious Conſtitution of Pope *Urban* the Second; and tells us, that the meaning of that Canon is only this (*k*)—*That if any man by Chance and Caſually had kill'd an Excommunicated Perſon, (ſi contigerit trucidaſſe) then he was not A Formal Murderer: So Pope* Urban's *Sentence was not to* (*l*) *Excuſe thoſe from Murder, who Intended, and directly Purpoſed to kill Hereticks and Excommunicate Perſons. For* (ſays he) *this were to* (m) *Overthrow all Truth and Fidelity to Princes.* The good man was (God forgive him) a *Roman Catholick*, and believed (though Erroneouſly) that the Supream Head of his Church, and St. *Peter*'s Succeſſor and Vicar of Chriſt, could not approve and maintain ſuch a Rebellious and Impious Poſition and Principle, *That men might lawfully be kill'd, becauſe they were Hereticks or Excommunicate Perſons:* which he there truly calls —(*n*) *A Horrible, Curſed and Execrable Principle.* That the Doctrine is *Curſed* and Execrable, is eaſily believed, and (by me) willingly granted. But that *Urban* the Second did not, in

(*g*) Vide Edit. Juris Canon. cum Gloſſis Pariſ. 1612. & Edit. ſine Gloſſis, Pariſ. 1618. & Editionem Lugduni, 1661. &c.

(*h*) Rev. 20. 2. 3.

(*i*) Remonſtrant. Hibernorum part. 5. c. 13. §. 10. pag. 34.

(k) *Si Contingenter trucidaverit, non eſſe Homicidam Formalem, &c.* Ibidem.

(l) *Urbani ideo Sententia Non fuit, Excommunicatos vel Hereticos De Propoſito interimi poſſe.* Ibidem.

(m) *Alioquin certe veritatem Omnem & Fidem expugnaſſet.* Ibidem.

(n) *Horrendum igitur Principium, Maledictum & Execrabile eſt, Hereticos, vel Excommunicatos, eo ipſo interimi poſſe, &c.* And again, *Inter Damnabilia & Anathemata reponimus.* Ibid. §. 11. p. 35.

that Canon, approve it, (notwithſtanding what Father *Caron* has ſaid to the contrary) I abſolutely deny. Sure I am, 1. That Cardinal *Bellarmine* (as is confeſſed by Father *Caron* in the place cited) expounds that Canon as I have done. 2. So does (o) Cardinal *Turrecremato* too; who ſays, *That Excommunicate Hereticks may be kill'd*, not only Caſually (as Father *Caron* miſtakes the Text) *but with an* (p) *Intention and Purpoſe to kill them; and yet they who intend and do kill them, be no Murderers; but both the Intention and Act Juſt and Innocent. But then their Intention muſt not be to get the Goods of thoſe Hereticks they kill, but it muſt be* Zelo Matris Eccleſiæ, *to ſecure the Church from the Miſchievous Deſigns of thoſe Hereticks.* So that in the Opinion of this great Cardinal, and Caniſt, (who well knew the opinions and practiſe of their Church) killing of Hereticks was ſo far from being *Murder*, that it was no Crime at all; but *ſine Reatu* (as he ſays) without all guilt; and therefore (*nulla pœnitentia erat imponenda*) it needed no Repentance. 3. Cardinal *Peron* in his Oration to the Eſtates of *France*, does expreſly (q) affirm, That *all Tyrants by Uſurpation*, may lawfully be *kill'd*; and ſuch was Queen *Elizabeth*, and all Proteſtant Kings and Princes now are, (in the Judgment of the Pope and his Party) ſeeing they all did, and now do ſtand Excommunicate (at *Rome*) and deprived of all Dominion; and therefore, their medling with the Government, after ſuch Deprivation, is evidently Uſurpation (in the Opinion of our Adverſaries) and then it follows (on

(o) Turrecremata ad Can. Excommunicator. 47. Cauſ. 23. Quæſt. 5.

(p) *Intentio requiritur, quia licet bonam habuerint voluntatem, potuerunt tamen peccare Intentione. Si Interfecerunt Hæreticos, quia Infeſtabant Eccleſiam, in hoc Bonam habuerunt Voluntatem; peccaverunt tamen ſi Intendebant habere Bona Hæreticorum. Si ergo bono Zelo & Mandato Eccleſiæ aliquos Interfecerunt, non ſunt Homicidæ Reatu, nec Ulla Pœnitentia eſt Impenenda.* Turrecremata loco dicto.

(q) *Agnoſcit Peronius,* (*Orat. ad Status, pag.* 107.) *Tyrannum Uſurpatione Licitè interimi poſſe: atqui Rex Omnis ſemel à Papa depoſitus, ſi poſtea adminiſtraverit, Rex Uſurpatione & Tyrannus eſt; quia abſque Jure Jus Uſurpat.* F. Caron. Remonſtrant. Hibernorum. part. 4. c. 1. §. 20. p. 265.

on their Principles) that they may lawfully be kill'd, and therefore the killing of them cannot be Murder; it being impoſſible that a Crime againſt the Indiſpenſable Law of Nature, ſhould be lawful. 4. But we have greater Evidence to prove, that (at *Rome*) the killing of Proteſtant Princes, (as Excommunicate Hereticks) is not Murder. For in the year 1648. when the *Parliament* was, (or ſeemed to be) ſevere againſt Papiſts, as believing and maintaining Principles Inconſiſtent with our Government: This Queſtion (amongſt others) was propoſed to ſome of our Engliſh Popiſh Divines—(r) *Whether the Pope could Depoſe or Kill Proteſtant Princes or Magiſtrates, as Excommunicate Perſons?* Some of thoſe Divines met, and (whether out of Love of Truth, or fear of the Parliament, I know not) (ſ) *Subſcribed the Negative; That the Pope could not Depoſe or Kill ſuch Proteſtants.* But when this was heard at (t) *Rome*, the Pope and his *Sacred Congregation* (as they call it) *Condemned that Negative Propoſition*, as Heretical, and Summon'd the Subſcribers to *Rome*, where Priſons and Cenſures (as Father *Caron* tells us) were prepared for them. Whence it is Evident, that to deny the Popes *Power to Depoſe and Kill Proteſtant Princes*, is (at *Rome*) declared *Heretical*; and therefore, that he has a Power to *Depoſe and Kill*, is a part of their Catholick Creed, and believ'd three. Whence it further follows, that they do think ſuch *Killing of Proteſtants* to be no *Murder*, nor thoſe who kill them, (out of Zeal to the Catholick Cauſe) *Murderers*. 5. When *Raymundus*

(r) *An Pontifex Romanus Principes ſeu Magiſtratus Proteſtantium poſſit deponere, vel Occidere, tanquam Excommunicatos?* Vide F. Caron Remonſtrant. Hibernorum part. 1. cap. 4. §. 3. p. 12.

(ſ) *Convenientibus ergo in hac Cauſa Theologis Anglicanis, pro Negativâ reſolverunt.* Ibid. §. 3. num. 3.

(t) *His nunciis Romæ receptis, ſacra Congregatio reſolutionem illam negativam, tanquam Hæreticam mox Condemnat, citatiſque Romam Authoribus, Carceres & Cenſuræ parantur.* Ibidem.

mundus (u) *Lullus* (a (x) man famous in his time and after it) had said, and in his Writings published, *That it was* (y) *unlawful and impious to kill and murder Hereticks*; (for he had seen and heard, of the bloody Persecutions of the *Waldenses*, and such as at *Rome* were call'd Hereticks, in, and before his time) *Nic. Eymericus* (Inquisitor of *Arragon*) complains of him, and his Writings, to Pope *Gregory* the Eleventh; who (in full Consistory with the (z) Council of his Cardinals) damns the Doctrine of *Raymundus Lullus*; and declares for the *Lawfulness* and *Justice* of *Killing Hereticks*. 6. And Lastly, Pope *Leo* the Tenth in his Oecumenical (so they call it) *Lateran Council* (*Sacro approbante Concilio*) with the Consent and Approbation of that Council) declares; *That our blessed Saviour* (a) *Did Institute* Peter *and his Successors his Vicars*; *to whom* (*by the Testimony of The Book of Kings*) *it was so necessary to yield Obedience, that Whosoever would not* (*as no true Protestant ever would or could*) *was to be punished with Death.* The Pope was not pleased to tell us, *what Book of Kings* (for in their Vulgar Latin Version, there are four Books of that name) nor what Chapter or Verse he meant: and he did wisely to conceal what Place in those Books he intended; for had he nam'd any particular place, (though he pretended to *Infallibility*) his *folly* would have much sooner appeared. It is indeed ridiculous, for any man to think, that any thing said in those Books of *Kings*, can prove, that our blessed Saviour Constituted a Vicar General over his whole Christian Church, with

(u) Floruit sub Greg. 11. circa Ann. 1311. Nicol. Eymericus Direct. Inquisit. p. 255. Col. 2. D.

(x) Possevin. Apparat. in Pet. Remundo.

(y) *Interficientes Hæreticos sunt Injuriosi & vitiosi in suo Memorari, Intelligere, & Velle, &c.* Eymericus Ibid. p. 260. Col. 2. A.

(z) *Greg.* 11. *in Consistorio, etiam de Consilio Fratrum, interdixit & condemnavit Doctrinam Raym. Lulli, &c.* Eymericus loco dicto. p. 255.

(a) *Christus Petrum Ejúsque Successores Vicarios suos Instituit, quibus* (*ex Libri Regum Testimonio*) *Ita Obedire Necesse est, ut qui non Obediret, Morte Moriatur.* Binius Concil. Tom. 9. pag. 151. Col. 2. E. Edit. Paris. 1636.

with power to kill all who would not comply with him, and that *Peter* and his Succeſſors the Popes, were the men: ſeeing there is not one Syllable of all, or any of this, in any of the four Books of *Kings*; Nor any Text from which it may (with any ſenſe or probability) be deduc'd. Nor have the Publiſhers of that *Lateran* and other Councils (*Peter Crab*, *Surius*, *Binius*, *Labbe*, *&c.* ſupply'd that defect, and told us, what place Pope *Leo* meant, and from which he, or they could prove *the Popes Power to kill all who comply'd not with his Commands.* I know that (*b*) *Crab*, (*c*) *Surius*, and (*d*) *Binius* (though *Labbe* has omitted it, as Impertinent) have, in their Editions of the Councils, cited in their Margents, *Deut.* 17. for a proof of that Erroneus and Impious Poſition, (it ſeems their Infallible Judge miſtook *Kings* for *Deuteronomy*, or that they could find nothing in any Book of *Kings* for the Popes purpoſe.) But they name not the Verſe; though (I believe) it is the Twelfth Verſe of that SeaventeenthChapter they mean. Where 'tis ſaid, *That he who will not hearken to the Prieſt or Judge, That Man ſhall Dye.* This (I ſay) is altogether impertinent, as to the proof of the Popes Poſition. For admit (which is (*e*) manifeſtly untrue) that by *Prieſt* here, the *High Prieſt* only was meant: yet it will neither be conſequence nor ſenſe to ſay, *Whoſoever diſobey'd the Sentence of the High Prieſt, in the Jewiſh Church, muſt be put to death:* Ergo, *Whoever diſobeys the Pope in the Chriſtian Church, muſt be ſo too.* This (I ſay) is Inconſequent, for the Prieſts in the Jewiſh Church (not only

(*b*) Pet. Crab. Concil. Colon. Agrip. 1551. Tom. 3. p. 694. Col. 2. So Turrecremata ſumma de Eccleſ. l. 2. cap. 114. Prop. 7.

(*c*) Laur. Surius Concil. Colon. Agripp. 1567. Tom. 4. p. 681. Col. 2.

(*d*) Binius Concil. Latet. Pariſ. 1636. Tom. 9. pag. 151. Col. 2. B.

(*e*) Vide Grotium and Ainſworth in Deut. 17. verſ. 9. 12. &c. Vide 2 Chron. 19. 8. 9. &c.

only the High Priest, but other Priests and Levites) by the express Law of God, had as Judges in many Cases, Power of Life and Death: but in the Gospel, our blessed Saviour left no such Power to his Apostles and their Successors; *Excommunication* is the highest Punishment, *Peter*, or any, or all the Apostles could inflict, by any Authority from our blessed Saviour in the Christian Church, and this Power succeeded Interfection or putting to death in the Judaical Church. So St. (*f*) *Augustin* expressly tells us, and to him I refer the Reader. By the Premisses, I think it may appear, that, if (after the Popes Damnation and Deposition of Queen *Elizabeth*) any of her Popish Subjects, (Laity or Clergy, Regular or Secular) had by taking Arms publickly, or by Poyson or Pistol, privately taken away her life, (according to their approved Principles) it had been no Rebellion, Treason or Murder, but (in their Opinion) an Action Just and Innocent. But this (though too much) is not all; their Error and Impiety rises higher. For,

(f) *Non nunc Agit in Ecclesia Excommunicatio, quod tunc (ante Christum in Synagoga) agebat Interfectio.* Aug. Quæst. super Deuteronomium, lib. 5. cap. 38. And elsewhere; *Phineas Sacerdos Adulteros simul Inventos ferro ultore confixit. Quod utiq; Degradationibus & Excommunicationibus, significatum esse faciendum hoc tempore.* Idem. Aug. de Fide & Bonis Operibus. cap. 6.

4. Had any of Queen *Elizabeths* Subjects (after the Popes Excommunication) kill'd her, that Execrable Fact had been so far from being Murder, that (in their opinion) it had been an Action not only *Indifferent, or Morally good, but Meritorious.* In the year 1586. (which was the Nine and twentieth of *Elizabeth*) in the Colledge of *Rhemes*, *Giffard*, Dr. of Divinity, *Gilbert Giffard* and *Hodgson*, Priests, had so possess'd the English Seminaries, with a belief of this Doctrine, That *John Savage*

Savage willingly and gladly vowed to kill the Queen. The Story is in (*g*) *Cambden* (an Hiſtorian of unqueſtionable truth and fidelity) *After* (h) *this*, Walpoole, *the Engliſh Jeſuite, perſwades* Edward Squire, *that it was a Meritorious Act to take away the Queen; tells him, it might eaſily be done, by Poyſoning the Pomel of her Sadle; gives him the Poyſon;* Squire *undertakes it*, Walpoole *bleſſeth him, and promiſes him Eternal Salvation, and ſo* (*having ſworn him to Secreſie*) *ſends him into* England: *where* (*notwithſtanding all the Jeſuits bleſſings*) *he was taken, confeſs'd all this, and was Executed in the year.* 1598. And *Camdben* (*i*) there tells us, *That a Peſtilent Opinion* (as he truly calls it) *was got amongſt the Popiſh Party* (*even amongſt their Prieſts*) *That to take away Kings Excommunicate, was Nothing Elſe, but to Weed the Cockle out of the Lords Field.* It is true, none of thoſe impious and damnable Deſigns, had their deſir'd Effect; God Almighty protecting that good Queen, (it being impoſſible that any Power or Policy ſhould prevail againſt his Providence) yet the Matter of Fact (confeſſed by themſelves, or evidently proved by Legal Witneſſes) manifeſtly ſhews, *that they thought killing the Queen*, (for the benefit of their Catholick Cauſe) *was a Meritorious Work*, which they deſigned to do, and (had their Ability been Equal to their Impiety) would have done. 2. Nor was this the *private opinion* of ſome *Prieſts and Jeſuits* only; but the *definitive Sentence* of ſeveral Popes, (their (*k*) Infallible and Supream Judges) publickly declared, and (that we may be ſure they

(g) *In the Engliſh Seminary at* Rhemes, *ſome there were, who believ'd*, Pius *the fifth's Bull to be dictated by the Holy Ghoſt, and they perſwaded themſelves and others, that it was meritorious to take away the lives of Princes Excommunicate, and Martyrdom to ſpend a man's life in the Cauſe. Theſe things* Giffard, *Dr. of Divinity*, Gilbert Giffard *and* Hodgſon *inculcated ſo deeply into* John Savage, *that he willingly and gladly vowed to kill Queen* Elizabeth. Camb. Annals of Q. Eliz. l. 3. p. 301. 302. of the Engliſh Edition, (I have not the Latin now by me) Lond. 1635.

(*h*) Ann. Chriſt. 1598. Eliz. 41. apud Cambdenum Annal. l. 4. p. 498. 499. dictæ Editionis.

(*i*) Ibid. p. 499.

(*k*) All the Popes *Sanctions* (they ſay) are Divine (Can. ſic Omnes. 2. diſt. 19.) *as if* Peter *himſelf had made them.* And no wonder, ſeeing they tell us, That God by his Holy Spirit, ſpeaks in the mouth of the Pope, *Deus ipſe, Spiritu ſuo, per Ora Pontificum loquitur.* Pet. Matthæus J. C. Lugdun. Præfat. præfixa Corp. Juris Can. à ſe Edito, Francof. 1590.

are *obligatory* at *Rome*) amongſt other Papal Decrees referr'd into the Body of *their Canon Law*, confirm'd by *Gregory* the Thirteenth, and by their *General Councils* (the *fifth Lateran*, and that of *Trent*) Commanded to be obeyed, *Tanquam Divina Inſpiratione Edita, & Tanquam* (l) *Dei Præcepta.* Now the Papal Sentences or Decrees I mean, are 1. That of *Pope* (m) *Nicolas to the French Army*: wherein the Pope tells them, *That if any of them were ſlain in that War againſt the Infidels, that is,* (as Cardinal (n) *Turrecremata* explains it) *againſt the Hereticks, Heaven* (o) *ſhould not be deny'd them:* They ſhould be ſure of that. But the *Lemma* or Summary prefix'd to the Canon (p) ſays, *That thoſe Souldiers who faithfully fought againſt the Hereticks, if any one of them were ſlain in the fight, He ſhould merit Heaven.* Murdering Hereticks, was (in the Popes Opinion) a *meritorious Work*, and if the Souldiers could kill them, and take away their Temporal Life here, they ſhould (for that good Service to the Pope) gain to themſelves, an Eternal Life hereafter. 2. Pope (q) *Leo* (to the ſame purpoſe, and almoſt in the ſame words) *Incourages a French Army to* (r) *fight ſtoutly againſt the Enemies of the Faith, and of the Church*, (you may be ſure he means the Roman Church) *and tells them, that they need not be any way affraid, to kill Hereticks and the Churches Enemies, for God knew, that if any of them died in that Service, it was for the true Faith, for which Heaven ſhould be their Reward.* So the Pope in that Canon. And becauſe ſome of thoſe Souldiers might fear (as there was great reaſon they ſhould

(k) Jnl.2.Conc.Lateran.5. Generali, approbante Concilio. Seſſ.5. apud Binium. Tom. 9. p. 48.Col.1. F.2.A.

(l) Concil. Trid.Seſſ. 25. De Reformat. c.20. p. 624. Edit. Antverp. 1633.

(m) Can.Omnium.46. Cauſa.23.Quæſt.5.

(n) Turrecremata ad dictum Canonem.

(o) *Regna illi Cœleſtia minime negabuntur.*

(p) *In Certamine quod Contra Infideles (Hæreticos) geritur quiſquis moritur Cœleſte Regum meretur.*

(q) Can.Omni Timore.9.Cauſ.23. Quæſt.8.

(r) *Omni timore Depoſito contra inimicos Sanctæ Eccleſiæ viriliter agere Studete, novit enim Omnipotens, ſi quilibet veſtrum morietur, quod pro veritate fidei mortuus eſt, & Ideo Præmium Cœleſte conſequitur.*

ſhould) that the Perſecuting thoſe poor Chriſtians, whom the Pope call'd Hereticks, with Fire and Sword, might rather deſerve puniſhment then a Heavenly Reward; *John Semeca* (the Gloſſator) tells us, *That the Popes meaning was*, (f) *that (being ſecured from Puniſhment) Heaven ſhould be their Reward.*

(f) *Hortatur Papa, ut viriliter pugnet contra Inimicos Eccleſiæ; & ſi qui propter hoc moriatur, Non Pœnam, ſed Cœleſte Præmium Conſequetur.* Gloſſa Ibidem.

Theſe, and ſuch other Principles, muſt (of neceſſity) be a great Incouragement to the Popiſh Party, who believe (though without, and in contradiction to Truth and Reaſon) the vaſt uſurped Papal Power and Infallibility, to Execute the Popes Damnatory Bulls and Excommunications, and kill all Hereticks (even Kings and Emperors) having Heaven promiſed for doing it. This is very much, but there are more and greater Promiſes made by the Pope, for *killing Hereticks*. For,

5. The Pope (out of his great Ability and Bounty) promiſes ſuch Impious and Bloody Murderers of Hereticks, not *Heaven only, but a higher Degree of Glory in it*, and many other great Priviledges, to be injoy'd here, before they came to Heaven; and this Promiſe the *Pope* makes, not ſingly by himſelf, but in, and with the conſent of the *greateſt General Council Rome* ever had. *Innocent* the Third is the Pope, and the (t) fourth *Lateran* is the Council I mean; in which (u) there were, above Twelve hundred Fathers. By the Authority of this (x) Council, an Army was to be raiſed for the (y) *Deſtruction of Hereticks* (the poor *Waldenſes*) and they were to have the ſame (z) Priviledges

(t) Conc. Later. magnum ſub Innocentio. 3. Ann. 1215.

(u) Ita Abbas Urſperg. in Chronico ad dictum Ann. 1215. Binius in Hiſt. Conc. Later. 4. præfixa.

(x) Can. 3. *De Hæreticis.*

(y) *Ad Hæreticorum Exterminium.*

(z) *Illa Indulgentia & Privilegio munti ſunt, quod Accedentibus ad terræ Sanctæ ſubſidium conceditur.* Ibid. dicto Can. 3.

ledges which were granted to thoſe who fought againſt the *Turks* to recover the *Holy Land*. What thoſe Priviledges were Pope *Innocent* (in his (a) Bull) tells us.

1. *They were to be freed from* (b) *all Taxes, Impoſitions, and all Burdens whatſoever.*
2. They were to be *received into the* (c) *Protection of St.* Peter *and the Pope*; there is nothing of *God's Protection* mention'd. The Pope (*who ſits in the Temple of God,* (d) *ſhewing himſelf that he is God*) thought (and would have them think ſo too) that he was ſufficient to protect them.
3. If they had borrowed any Money upon Uſe, and had ſolemnly ſworn to pay it; yet the Pope *Commands* that they *ſhall be freed both from their* (e) *Oath, and paying any Uſe.*
4. If they went to kill and exterminate Hereticks *in Perſon*, and at their *own Expences*, then *A Full* (f) *and Plenary Pardon of All their Sins here, and A Greater Degree of Glory hereafter, is* (by the Pope and that great General Council) *promiſed them.*

By the Premiſſes I think it evident, that if any of Queen *Elizabeths* Subjects (after her Damnation and Excommunication by the Pope) had by raiſing Arms againſt her publickly, or by Poyſon or Piſtol privately taken away her Life, it had neither been *Rebellion*, *Treaſon*, nor *Murder*, but an innocent Action; And that not one of thoſe which *Ariſtotle* calls τὰ μέσα, *Naturæ Mediæ*, and Indifferent, which are morally neither good nor bad; but (in the Judgment of the Church of *Rome*,

(a) Conſt. Innocent. 3. 12. data Lateran. 19. Cal. Jan. 1215.

(b) *A Collectis, Talliis, aliiſque gravaminibus ſunt Immunes.* Bullæ dictæ. §. 10.

(c) *Quorum Perſonas & Bona ſua ſub Beati Petri & Noſtrâ Protectione ſuſcipimus.* Ibidem.

(d) 2. Theſſ. 2. 4.

(e) *Si ad Præſtandas uſuras Juramento teneantur aſtricti, Creditores ut remittant Juramentum & Uſuras Compelli præcipimus.* Ibid. §. 11.

(f) *Plenam peccatorum Veniam Indulgemus, & Salutis Æternæ pollicemur Augmentum.* Ibidem §. 17. In Bullario Romano, Romæ, 1638. Tom. 1. p. 78. Col. 7. vide Matth. Pariſ. ad Ann. 1213. In Johanne. pag. 241.

Rome, and upon thoſe her approved Principles) it had been an Action *Morally Good*, nay, (which is far more) *Meritorious*: For which they *ſhould have Remiſſion of All their Sins here*, and not *only Heaven*, but (in it) *A higher Degree of Glory* hereafter: And if it happened, that any of them miſcarried in this their *meritorious* Act of killing Heretical Kings, and were (according to their deſert) hang'd for Treaſon, then (with the Pope and his Party) they paſs for *Martyrs*, and as ſuch, ſhall be honour'd, and highly commended to Poſterity. I wrong them not, *Ribadeneira* the Jeſuit (to omit many others) in a (g) Book *Licenced by the* (h) *Vice-Provincial* of *Toledo*, approved by the Biſhop of (i) *Antverp*, and (k) *other Grave and Learned Men* (as they are there call'd) I ſay, in this Book he has a (l) *Century of Martyrs* of his Society; and amongſt them, reckons (m) *Campian*, (n) *Walpoole*, (o) *Southwell*, (p) *Garnett*, (q) *Oldcorne*, *&c.* and calls them *Martyrs*; who were *Legally Convict* here, and *Juſtly Executed* as *Impious Traitors*. God Almighty preſerve our Gracious King from the Traiterous and Pernicious Conſpiracies of thoſe men, who (by a ſtrange deluſion) believe ſuch Principles, and call Impious Traitors Holy Martyrs.

The Premiſſes conſider'd, there can be little reaſon to doubt, but the Popiſh Party (as ever ſince the Reformation they conſtantly have, ſo they) always will indeavour by ſecret Plots and Conſpiracies, by Poyſon, Piſtols, or (when they have Ability) by open War, to ruin and utterly ex-

(g) Catalogus Scriptorum Religionis Societatis Jeſu; Auctore Pet. Ribadeneira, Ejuſdem Societ. Theol. Antverp. 1613.

(h) Ferdinandus Lucero in Cenſura Libro præfixa, Madriti, 17. Sept. 1607.

(i) Lavin. Torrentius in Oda ad Societatem Libr. præfixa.

(k) *Gravium doctorumque hominum Judicio Probatus.* Ferd. Lucero in dicta Cenſura.

(l) Dicti Libri. p. 357. 358. &c.

(m) Ibid. p. 366.

(n) Ibid p. 371.

(o) Ibid. p. 372.

(p) In ſupplemento ad dictam Centuriam. pag. 375.

(q) Ibidem.

extirpate and destroy all the Protestants of this Nation (King and Subjects) who are by the Pope Declared and Excommunicated Hereticks, seeing there are such exceeding great Rewards (aforemention'd) assured to them, for doing it; not only by private and fallible persons, but by the Constitutions of their Popes, and the Canons of their greatest and approved General Councils; their Supream Judge and Infallible Guide, which all Papists (by the Principles of their Religion) are bound to *obey, and act according to such Canons and Constitutions.* And were they indeed (what they pretend to) Infallible, it were great folly and madness not to do so. For he is certainly a Fool, who (having a Journey to go, on which the Eternal misery or felicity of his Soul depends) will not follow an Infallible Guide. And (which is further very considerable) *All their* (r) *Dignities in all Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, All who have Cure of Souls, All who are provided for, and preferr'd to any* (s) *Monastery, or Religious House whatsoever, be they of whatsoever Order of Regulars.* And not only these; but (t) *All Doctors, Masters, Regents, and Professors of any Art or Faculty, whether they be of the Laity or Clergy, or Regulars of any Or-*

(r) *Omnes, quas Cathedralibus & Superioribus Ecclesiis præfici, vel quibus de illarum dignitatibus, Canonicatibus & aliis quibuscunque Beneficiis Ecclesiasticis, Curam Animarum habentibus, providere Contingat, publicam Orthodoxæ fidei professionem facere, seque in Rom. Ecclesiæ Obedientiâ permansuros, Spondere & Jurare teneantur.* Vide Bullam Pij. 4. super forma Juramenti Professionis fidei, in Concilio Trident. Sess. 24. De Reformat. Cap. 12. pag. 450. Edit. Antverp. 1633.

(s) *Etiam per quoscunque quibus de Monasteriis, Conventibus, Domibus, & aliis quibuscunque loci, Regularium quorumcunque Ordinum, etiam Militiarum, quocunque nomine providebitur, idem Servari.* Idem. pag. 451. Extat etiam in Bullario Romano. Edit. Romæ, 1638. Tom. 2. pag. 97. Dat. Ibid. Novem. 1564. Pontificatus sui Ann. 5. (t) *Nullus Doctor, Magister, Regens, vel alius cujuscunque Artis & Facultatis Professor, sive Clericus, sive Laicus, ac Secularis, vel cujusvis Ordinis Regularis, sit in quibusvis Universitatibus aut Gymnasiis publicis, aut Alibi Lectoris Cathedram obtinere, aut obtentam retinere, seu alias Theologiam, Canonicam vel Civilem Censuram, Medicinam, Philosophiam, Grammaticam vel alias Artes Liberales, publice vel privatim profiteri, nisi Juramento prius præstito.* &c. Bulla Pij. 4. in Bullario Rom. Tom. 2. p. 96. & cap. In Sacro Sancta. 2. De Magist. & Doctoribus in 7.

der

der whatſoever, in any Univerſity, publick School, or any where elſe, in Cities, Univerſities, Towns, Churches or Monaſteries; whether they profeſs Divinity, Canon or Civil Law, Phyſick, Philoſophy, Grammar, or any other Liberal Art, publickly or privately, and all who take any Degrees in any Univerſity; All theſe (that is, almoſt all the Learned men in the Papacy) *by the* (u) *Diſpoſition and Appointment of the Pope and Council of* Trent, *are to* (x) *promiſe, vow, and ſwear to obey the Pope as* Peter's *Succeſſor and Chriſt's Vicar, and to receive, and without All Doubting to Profeſs all Things deliver'd, defin'd, and declared in the Sacred Canons, and General Councils, Eſpecially in the Council of* Trent; *and all this they ſwear to do moſt conſtantly ſo long as they live, and to take care* (*to the utmoſt of their Ability*) *that all under them, or committed to their Charge, ſhall do ſo too.* And the Pope there further tells us, (y) *That God Almighty did by the Holy Ghoſt Inſpire the* Trent *Fathers to require, That this Oath ſhould be taken.* Seeing then there are ſo many thouſands in the Church of *Rome*, who do and muſt take this curſed Oath, to Obey the Pope, and *receive*, and without doubting believe all their Rebellious Canons before mention'd, and (to the utmoſt of their Power) to perſwade and induce all who are under their Cure and Charge (that is, all the Laity in the whole *Roman Church*, for all of them are under the Charge and Cure of ſome of thoſe who take that Oath) to *receive* and believe them too. Hence it manifeſtly follows, 1. *That the Church of* Rome *approves thoſe impious and rebellious Doctrines to which ſo many thou-*

(u) Juxta diſpoſitionem Conc. Trid. in Conſtit. 89. Pij. 4. Bullar. Rom. Tom. 2. pag. 97.

(x) *Romano Pontifici, Petri Apoſtolorum Principis Succeſſori, & Chriſti Vicario veram Obedientiam Spondeo, ac Juro. Catera item Omnia à Sacris Canonibus & Oecumenicis Conciliis, Præcipuè à Trident. Synodo tradita, definita ac declarata, Indubitanter recipio & profiteor, & ad Ultimum vitæ ſpiritum Conſtantiſſimè retinere ac profiteri, & à meis ſubditis, illiſque quorum Cura ad me ſpectat, teneri, quantum in me eſt, Curaturum. Ego. N. Spondeo, Voveo, Juro, &c.* p. 98. §. 2. dictæ Bullæ.

(y) *Deus Omnipotens Patribus* (*Tridentinis*) *Divinitus Inſpirare Dignatus eſt.* Ibidem, in dictæ Bullæ Initio.

thousands swear, by the Command of the Pope and Trent *Council.* 2. *That all their Ecclesiasticks (Secular and Regular) who have any Cure of Souls and Charge over others, are bound, not only by their Papal Constitutions and Decrees of their General Councils; but by a Personal Promise, Vow, and Oath,* (in facinus Jurasse putes) *to believe and profess, and (as there is opportunity) to practise according to these Principles.* 3. And hence it appears, *That Queen* Elizabeth *was* (and all Protestant Kings and Princes are, and in the like case, will be) *in most eminent Danger of assassination by her Popish Subjects, especially after Pope* Pius *the fifth had damn'd, and deposed her, absolved all her Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance, and Commanded them (on pain of Excommunication) never to obey her, or any of her Laws or Commands*; it being also declared, by their Supream Infallible Power, *That the killing the Queen, by open War publickly, or privately by Poyson or Pistol, had neither been Rebellion, Treason, nor Murder, but an Act morally good and meritorious; by which they should merit, not only Heaven, but a higher Degree of Glory in it, and be, as Glorious Martyrs (if they died in that Cause) commended to Posterity*; Nay, when their Ecclesiasticks (both Secular and Regular) who had any Cure of Souls, or Authority and Charge over others, had promised, vow'd, and solemnly sworn, *That they would obey the Pope as Christs Vicar, &c.* I say, those who had such great Promises to allure them, and their Promise, Oath and vow to oblige them to it, would certainly indeavour (as indeed they did, as will appear anon) the ruin and destruction

ction of that good Queen. Neither is this all. For

6. Laſtly; the Pope and his Party have further Inducements, more efficacious and powerful to perſwade their Inſtruments to Aſſaſſinate Princes and Extirpate Hereticks, *eſpecially* (z) *Proteſtants*, the *greateſt* Enemies of their Antichriſtian Tyranny, and Papal Uſurpations. For although to pious men, (who really deſire, and uſe the juſt means to obtain it) the promiſe of Eternal Joys in Heaven, is the greateſt Motive and Incouragement imaginable; yet to ſuch Impious and Prodigious Villains (who will undertake to kill Kings and murder Innocents) Heaven ſignifies no more, then the Diamond did to *Æſop*'s Cock in the Fable, who preferr'd a Grain of Barly before it. And therefore, for ſuch, (and none but ſuch will ſerve them in the Execution of ſuch Execrable Villanies) they have preſent and more prevailing Incouragements; I mean Money and great Sums of Gold, or ſome vaſt Temporal Advantages to be injoy'd here; which prevails more with ſuch Perſons, then the Promiſe of Heaven hereafter: I ſhall (out of many) give two or three Inſtances. As,

(z) They are more affraid of Proteſtants, then of all others they call Hereticks, and there is good reaſon for it. For truth (which the Proteſtants conſtantly maintain) is more deſtructive of their Popiſh Errors, then any one Error can be of another. *Extrema (Errores & vitia) facile Coexiſtunt; Media (virtutes & veritates) Extrema deſtruunt.* This appears, 1. Becauſe they will not permit their *Italian* Papiſts to live in any Proteſtant County. *Prohibentur Nunc Itali Catholici habitare, ſeu Commorari extra Italiam Occaſione Mercimonij abſq; Licentiâ Inquiſitorum, ſi in illis partibus non viget Libertas Religionis Catholicæ.* Vide Conſt. 42. Clement. 8. in Bullario Rom. Tom. 3. pag. 42. 2. They permit no Hereticks (Proteſtants you may be ſure eſpecially) to inhabit in *Italy*, or the adjacent Iſles, on pretenſe of Merchandize, &c. *Gregorius. 15. ſub graviſſimis pœnis vetuit, Hereticos quoſcunque etiam ſub prætextu Commercij habere domum apertam propriam, vel Conductam in Italiâ, vel adjacientibus inſulis.* Gregorius. 15. in Conſtitut. 38. In dicto Bullario. Tom. 3. pag. 314. Edit. Romæ. 1638. Vide Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugduni. 1661. & ibi Annotationes in Calce Tom. 2. pag. 55. 3. Becauſe 'tis notoriouſly known, that they permit Jews, (who deny Jeſus Chriſt, and the whole Goſpel) to live and have Houſes, even in *Rome* it ſelf, and yet they will not permit Proteſtants. It is a leſs Crime (it ſeems) at *Rome*, to deny Jeſus Chriſt, then to deny (what all Proteſtants do) that the Pope is his Vicar, and Monarchical Head of the whole Chriſtian Church.

1. In the year. 1594. (*a*) *Roderigo Lopez* (a Jew and Phyſician) *Stephen Ferriera Gama*, and *Emanuel Loiſie* (two *Portugals*) by the Roman Arts and Impiety, were hired, and undertook to Poyſon Queen *Elizabeth*. *Lopez* had a rich Jewel ſent him, and was (by Contract) to have (*b*) Fifty thouſand Duckets; which evidently appeared (at their Trial) by their own Confeſſions. And though Letters intercepted, and the Good Providence of God (by whom Kings Reign) their Villany was detected, and they (as Traitors) juſtly Executed; yet their Popiſh Deſires and Indeavours were not leſs miſchievous and impious, becauſe the Good Providence of God graciouſly prevented the Execution of their Deſigns.

2. This, by the Mercy of God not taking Effect, (for there is no Power or Policy can prevail againſt Divine Providence) a little after in the (*c*) ſame year, *Edmund York* and *Richard Williams*, were (by the ſame Roman Arts and Impiety) hired to *Kill the Queen*. *York* (at his Trial) confeſs'd, That *Holt* the *Jeſuit*, *Hugh Owen*, *Jacomo de Franciſco*, and others, had offer'd him an Aſſignment of (*d*) Forty thouſand Duckets, if he would *Kill the Queen* himſelf, or aſſiſt *Richard Williams* in *Killing Her*. This *York* confeſs'd at his Trial; and that *Holt* the Jeſuit (in whoſe Hand the Aſſignment of Forty thouſand Duckets was depoſited) kiſſing the Holy Hoſt, ſwore that the Money ſhould be paid ſo ſoon as the Queen was kill'd; and bound *York* and

(*a*) Cambdens Eliz. l. 4. ad Ann. 1594. p. 430. 431. Edit. Lond. 1635.

(*b*) Fifty thouſand Duckets promiſed by the Popiſh Party, for Poyſoning Q. *Elizabeth*.

(*c*) Cambdens Eliz. l. 4. ad Ann. 1594. 1596. p. 440. vide Plura in Statuto de Ann. 3. Jac. c. 2.

(*d*) Forty thouſand Duckets promiſed for killing Q. *Elizabeth*.

and *Williams* by an Oath, and the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, *To Diſpatch it.*

In ſhort, many others (beſides theſe named) conſpired the aſſaſſination and death of the Queen. For Inſtance; (to omit others) 1. Dr. (*e*) *Story*, *Ann.* 1572. 2. (*f*) *Somervil*, *Ann.* 1583. 3. Dr. (*g*) *Parry*, *Ann.* 1585. by the Approbation and Incouragement of the Pope and Cardinal *Como.* 4. *John* (*h*) *Savage*, *Ann.* 1586. 5. *Ant.* (*i*) *Babington*; and five or ſix more with him are incouraged and perſwaded to Murder the Queen, in the ſame year, 1586. 6. (*k*) *Moody*, *Ann.* 1587. 7. *Patrich* (*l*) *Cullen*, *Ann.* 1594. 8. *Edward* (*m*) *Squire*, *Ann.* 1598. 9. (*n*) *Winter* and *Teſmond* the Jeſuit, *Ann.* 1602. &c. We ſee there were many (too many) deſperate Villains, who valued not their own, ſo that they might take away the Queens life; and yet too few (Divine Providence preventing their Impious Deſigns) to Effect and Compaſs that (more then Pagan) *Popiſh Conſpiracy*, which at (ſo vaſt an Expence of Money) the Pope and his Party deſigned and earneſtly deſired, and indeavour'd to Execute.

(*e*) Cambdens Eliz. l.2.p.144.145.
(*f*) Ibid.l.3. p.257.
(*g*) Ibid.l.3.p.272.
(*h*) Ibid.l.3.p.302.
(*i*) Ibid.p.303.
(*k*) Ibid.p.336.
(*l*) Ibid.l.4. p.431.
(*m*) Ibid.l.4.p.498.
(*n*) Ibid.l.4.p.578.

3. When all this would not do; and the Pope and his Party plainly ſaw, that they could not cut off the Queen by Piſtol, Poyſon, or private Aſſaſſinations, *horrendum & majus machinantur ſcelus:* they deſign by Fire and Sword, by open War, utterly to deſtroy that good Queen, and all her Heretical (that is, Loyal) Subjects. And to this end, (beſides Plenary Indulgence

and Pardon of all ſins here, and the Kingdom of Heaven hereafter) *Pius* the Fifth promiſes, and immediately gives two whole Kingdoms (*England* and *Ireland*) to *Philip* the Second, King of *Spain*; as is notoriouſly known, and (*o*) confeſs'd by their own Popiſh Writers. His Succeſſors, *Gregory* the Thirteenth, and *Sixtus* the Fifth, renue and confirm the Excommunication of *Elizabeth*, and the donation of her Kingdoms; and accordingly (not with Gods, but) with the Popes (*p*) *Approbation* and Bleſſing, in that memorable year 1588. the (vainly ſuppoſed) Invincible Armado was ſent to deſtroy the damn'd Hereticks (the Queen and her Loyal Subjects) and take Poſſeſſion of her Kingdoms, which the Pope had given him. The Pretences the Pope had to give thoſe Kingdoms, (for they were but miſerable Pretences, void of all Reaſon and Juſtice) were Two. 1. King *John*'s Donation and (*q*) Reſignation of his Crown to Pope *Innocent* the Third, about the year, 1213. when that King and the whole Nation groaned under many Miſeries and Papal Oppreſſions. Which Act of King *John* was invalid and abſolutely Null; he having no juſt Power to give away his Kingdom. And even then declared to be Null; not only by the Engliſh Barons and Nation, but by the King of (*r*) *France* and his Nobility, as *Matthew Paris* tells us. 2. Nor is it only *Matthew Paris* who ſays that the Kings of *England* and *Ireland* are (ſince King *John*'s time)

(*o*) *Pius.5. In Depoſitione Eliz. Jus Britanniæ, Hiberniæque ad Philip. 2. Hiſpaniæ Regem tranſtulit; vi cujus donationis, d. mandatus poſtea Sidonius fuit. Ann.* 1588. *Claſſe Hiſpanicâ Inſtructus, ut Regna Britanniæ Poſſideret.* F.R.Caron, Remonſtrant.Hibernorum.Part. c.3.5.4.p.7.

(*p*) *Sixtus* the Fifth was Pope, and it was in the fourth year of his Popedom. Vide Cambd. Eliz. l.3. ad Ann. 1588. p.360.361.

(*q*) Matth. Pariſ. ad dictum Ann.1213. pag. 236.

(r) *Rex Francorum reſpondet, Regnum Angliæ Patrimonium Petri nunquam fuit; Nec eſt, Nec erit. Nullus Rex poteſt dare Regnum ſuum, ſine aſſenſu Baronum ſuorum, Qui Regnum tenentur defendere. Tunc Magnates Omnes Uno Ore clamabant, quod iſto Articulo ſtarent uſque ad mortem, non Rex vel Princeps per Sol. m voluntatem ſuam poſſit Regnum dare, vel tributa. ium facere, unde nobiles regni eſſent ſervi.* Matth.Paris in Johanne ad Ann. 1213.

time) Tribuiaries to the Pope, (as they pretend) but their Hiſtorians, Canoniſts, and the Popes themſelves. So (*ſ*) *Matthew Weſtminſter*, *Henry* (*t*) *Knighton*, Cardinal *Tuſcus*, &c. The Cardinal tells us, *That the Pope is the Supream* (u) *Judge of All. That he can Depoſe the* (x) *Emperor, Kings, Dukes, and All who Acknowledge No Superior; and that the Kings of* England, *and* Sicilie *are* (y) *Tributaries to the Church of* Rome. *And he who denies this Papal* (z) *Power, is No Chriſtian.* And for *Ireland*; Pope *John* the Two and twentieth, in a Bull to our King *Edward* the Second, tells him, That his Predeceſſor, *Adrian* the Fourth, Gave the Kingdom of *Ireland* to *Henry* the Second, King of *England*, upon certain Conditions, which Conditions our King had not kept. And this ridiculous Bull we have in *Matthew Paris*, *ad Ann.* 1156. *pag.* 95. where he tells us, *That all the Iſlands in the World, which are Chriſtian, belong to* Peter, *and ſo to the Pope.* See Archbiſhop *Uſher* of the Religion profeſs'd by the Ancient *Iriſh*, *pag.* 51. 92. 93. 94. &c. And upon theſe (and ſuch like ridiculous) Pretenſes, the Pope required *Edward* the Third to do him (*a*) *Homage* for the Kingdoms of *England* and *Ireland*, and the Arrears of One thouſand Marks *per Annum.* All the Popes pretences were in a full Popiſh Parliament declared vain and evidently null; as appears by my Lord (*b*) *Cooke*, and the Record before mention'd. Beſides; 'tis certain that *John* was an Uſurper, and had only Poſſeſſion of

(*ſ*) Matth. Weſtmin. ad Ann. 1213. p. 271. Johannes Rex eſt Papæ Tributarius, ſeu Feudatarius.

(*t*) Hen. Knighton de Event. Angl. l. 2. c. 15. p. 2420.

(*u*) Card. Tuſchus Pract. Concluſ. Juris. Tom. 6. Concluſ. 41.

(x) *Papa poteſt deponere Imperatorem, Reges, Duces, & Omnes qui de facto Superiorem non recognoſcunt.* Ibid. §. 49.

(y) *Rex Angliæ & Siciliæ ſunt Tributarij Eccleſiæ Romanæ.* Ibid. §. 34.

(z) *Qui negat poteſtatem Papæ, Negat ſe Chriſtianum.* Ibid. §. 37.

(*a*) Vid. Conſt. 4. Johan. Papæ, 22. In Bullar. Rom. Tom. 1. p. 172. Edit. Rom. 1638.

(*b*) My Lord *Cooke* Inſt. Part. 4. c. 1. p. 13.

of the Crown, but no juſt Right and Title to it. For *Elinor*, Daughter to *Jeffery* his Elder Brother, was living, and was the true Heir of the Crown; ſo that King *John*'s Reſignation of the Crown to the Pope, was abſolutely null; it being impoſſible he ſhould give a Juſt Title to another, who had none himſelf. His ſecond Pretence was, that the Queen being an Excommunicate and Depoſed Heretick, (as he was pleaſed to miſcall her) her Kingdom was forfeited to him, by the Canon of their great *Lateran Council*. Wherein 'tis (*c*) declared, That ſuch obſtinate Perſons (as they call the Queen) when they ſtood Excommunicate, and would not give Satisfaction, the Pope was to abſolve their *Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance, and give their Lands and Kingdoms to Catholicks:* who by that Canon, were bound to Exterminate or Extirpate (*d*) all Hereticks. Upon the aforeſaid Sandy Foundations, the Popes ſucceſſively ſince King *John*'s time, build their Right to the Crown of *England*; and believe, (or at leaſt ſay, and would have others believe) that the Imperial or Royal Power of *England* and *Ireland* is in them; and our Kings only *Beneficiarij & Feudatarij* (as the Civil Law calls them) Feudataries to the Pope, of whom (as their Supream Lord) they hold their Kingdoms. Whence it was, that Pope *Innocent* the Third, in his Letter to *Philip* King of *France*, calls the King of *England* his (*e*) *Vaſſal*. And his Succeſſor, Pope *Innocent* the Fourth (with a Prodi-

gious

(c) *Significetur Pontifici, ut Ipſe Vaſallos à fidelitate abſolvat, & Terram Exponat Catholicis occupandam.* Conc. Lateran. 4. Can. 3. De Hæreticis. And it now goes for Law. Cap. 13. Extra. de Hæreticis.

(d) *Qui terram illam Exterminatis Hæreticis abſque ullâ Contradictione poſſideant, & in fidei puritate conſervent.* Ibidem.

(e) *Papa Philippo Francorum Regi Literas mittit, in quibus rogat ut Regem Angliæ non Inquietaret; ſed ut Romanæ Eccleſiæ Vaſallum protegeret.* Mat. Paris Hiſt. an Ann. 1216. p. 280. In Johanne.

gious Antichriſtian Pride and Impiety) calls our King (*Henry* the Third was then King) *His Vaſſal*, and (which is more) his *Slave*. *What* (ſays he) (*f*) *Is not the King of* England *our Vaſſal? Nay, that I may ſay more, our Slave?* Theſe are his words, and expreſſions, of ſuch prodigious Pride, as is abſolutely Inconſiſtent with that great and exemplary *Humility*, which our bleſſed (*g*) Saviour practis'd in his own Perſon, and *Commanded all* (even (*h*) *Peter and his Apoſtles*) *to imitate:* But yet congruous enough, and conſiſtent with *the Hypocriſie* of him, who would be call'd *Servus Servorum Dei*, the Servant of all Gods Servants; and yet as *the Man of Sin* (mention'd by the (*i*) Apoſtle) *Exalts himſelf above all that is called God*, and (with Pope *Innocent* the Fourth, in the place now cited) calls Kings his *Slaves* and *Vaſſals*.

(f) *Papa non ſe capiens præ ira & indignatione* (it was *Groſtheads* Letter had angred him) *torvo aſpectu, & ſuperbo animo, ait: Nonne Rex Anglorum noſter eſt Vaſallus, & ut plus dicam Mancipium?* Mat. Paris Hiſt. in Hen. 3. ad Ann. Dom. 1253. p. 872. in Edit. G. Watſij. London. 1640.

(*g*) Matth. 20. 28. Luc. 22. 27.

(*h*) Matth. 20. 45. 46. 47. & Matth. 23. 11. 12. Luc. 22. 24. 25. 26.

(*i*) 2. Theſſ. 2. 4.

'Tis true, we believe and know, that the Pope indeed had no Power to performe thoſe aforeſaid Promiſes; and ſo in making them was (to all intelligent, ſober, and prious Perſons) not only impious, but ridiculous; yet to thoſe of his Popiſh Party, who (having ſtrong deluſion to believe a Lye) were perſwaded he had Power to make good his Promiſes; that he was Chriſts Vicar, Supream Head and Monarch of the Church; that he had the Power of the Keys, and ſo could ſhut and open, keep out and let into Heaven whom he pleaſed, that he could by

by this Power Depoſe (*k*) Kings, and was *Infallible* and (*l*) *never Err'd* (for theſe Erroneous and Impious Poſitions are (*m*) approved and received at *Rome*) I ſay, ſuch Promiſes, made by ſuch a Perſon, were very great. And (to ſuch deluded Perſons, who were perſwaded of the truth and reality of them) prevailing Incouragements, to make them deſperately indeavour to Aſſaſſinate and Murder Queen *Elizabeth*. Forty or Fifty thouſand Duckets promiſed, was great and inticeing Wages for doing ſuch a Work, and actually prevail'd with many to endeavour it. But when (what the Pope promiſed *Philip* King of *Spain*) two whole Kingdoms here, and the Kingdom of Heaven hereafter are promiſed for deſtroying the Hereticks (the Queen and her Loyal Subjects) this was ſuch an offer, as could not be refuſed by any who deſired (as moſt do) Wealth or Honour here; or (as all ſhould do) the Joys of Heaven hereafter. Theſe were the Impious Policies, and Bloody Practices of *Rome*, to deſtroy Queen *Elizabeth* and her Proteſtant Subjects: and as their fear of the Proteſtant Religion, (deſtructive of their Superſtition and Idolatry) continued, ſo their hate of it, and their deſire and indeavours to deſtroy all the Profeſſors of it. For the Queen being dead, in the beginning of King *James* his Reign (upon the aforemention'd, or the like motives) they undertook the Gunpowder (*n*) Conſpiracy,

(*k*) *Greg.*7. depoſeth *Hen.*4. Emperor, by the Power of the Keys. *Poteſtas Ligandi & Solvendi in Cœlo & Terrâ, mihi à Deo data. Hac ideo fiducia fretus, Henrico totius Regni Teutonini & Italiæ gubernacula Interdico, & Omnes Chriſtianos, à vinculo Juramenti, quod ſibi fecere, abſolvo.* Baronius Annal Tom.11.ad Ann. 1076.§.25.26.

(*l*) *Eccleſia Rom. Nunquam Erravit, nec in perpetuum (Scripturâ teſtante) Errabit. Inter Dictatus Papæ.* Ibid. apud Bar.§.33. p.479. Edit. Antv.1608.

(m) *Dictatus ſeu Sententiæ Breviores Gregorij Papæ, Quæ Hactenus in Eccleſiâ Catholicâ uſu receptæ, ut ex his reprimeretur audacia Schiſmaticorum Epiſcoporum & Principum.* Baron. Ibid.§.31. p.479. And Pope *Leo.*10. in their General *Lateran* Council, 1513. and in his Bull in Bullario Rom. Romæ, 1638. Tom.1. p. 451. ſays the ſame thing, that the Church and Pope of *Rome* have never err'd. Ibid. in Conſtit. Leo.10.40.§.3. & 6.

(*n*) Vide Stat. 3. Jac. Capp.1.& 2. *A Conſpiracy undertaken by Malignant and Deviliſh Jeſuits and Prieſts.* Ibid. Cap.1. *A Deſign ſo barbarous and barous, execrable, and cruel, as the like was never before heard of.* Ibidem. *The moſt wicked barbarous abominable Treaſon that ever enter'd into the heart of the moſt wicked man.* Ibid. cap. 2.

racy,

racy, (ſuch a horrid and helliſh Villany, as no Turkiſh or Pagan Story can parallel) wherein they indeavour'd, and (if the Powerful Providence of Heaven had not hinder'd it) had Aſſaſſinated, not not the King only, but the whole Kingdom, in its Repreſentative. And further, (to omit the bloody and barbarous Aſſaſſinations of (*o*) *Henry* the Third of *France*, by *Jaques Clement*, and of *Henry* the Fourth, by *Raviliac*, (*p*) incouraged to thoſe Villanies by Jeſuitical and Popiſh Principles and Promiſes; for *Raviliac* confeſs'd, *That it was the Book of* Mariana *the Jeſuite, and the Traiterous Poſitions maintain'd in it, which induced him to that Prodigious Villany, the Murder of the King*; for which Cauſe that Book (Damn'd by the Sentence of the Parliament and *Sorbon*) was publickly burnt in *Paris*. I ſay, to let theſe, and ſuch Inſtances paſs, it is too well known and believ'd, that in the late (*q*) horrid and helliſh Conſpiracy (continued and carried on, principally by the Jeſuits) to take away the Life of our Gracious King (whom God preſerve) one of the Aſſaſſins had Fifteen thouſand pounds pay'd or promiſed, and another, Thirty thouſand Maſſes to be ſaid for him, if he miſcarried, to Incourage them to that Monſtrous Popiſh Villany. Now their Impiety in this their Ingagement, was equal; both undertaking the Commiſſion of the ſame Sin, the Murder of their King: But their folly ſeem'd unequal. For Fifteen thouſand pounds might poſſibly (in this World) have been ſome benefit to him who contracted for it: But the 30000. Maſſes, were altogether

(*o*) Vid. Thuani Hiſt. Tom. 4. lib. 95. ad Ann. 1598.

(*p*) Vide Anticoton, by *Peter Du Moulin*. In that Pyramid erected in *Paris* upon the Murder of *Henry* the Fourth, the Jeſuits are noted as men, *Malificæ Superſtitionis, Quorum Inſtinctu, piacularis Adoleſcens* (Raviliac) *Dirum facinus* (the murder of the King) *Inſtituerat*.

(*q*) Ann. 1678. & 1679.

gether Insignificant, and could be no way beneficial or profitable to him to whom they were promised, either in this, or the World to come. The poor Miscreant was cozen'd by his Party, with the noise and number of their Masses. For they knew, and (had he not been a Fool as well as Knave and Villain) so might he too; that those Masses could never do him any good. For even by their own approved and received Principles, killing of Hereticks (especially an Excommnicated Prince) was such a meritorious Work, as (without any Masses) deserved a Plenary Indulgence and Pardon of all his Sins, and an higher place in Heaven; and therefore he could *not go to* (r) *Purgatory* (had there been any such Place) nor could the Devil or the Pope punish him there, for such Sins as were absolutely pardon'd, and all the Punishment due to them remitted; I say, they could not justly do it: or admit the Devil (had he power and permission) might be willing to punish an innocent Soul, which had no Sin to punish; yet sure his Holiness (who as Christs Vicar has the Keys of Purgatory as well as Heaven) would not do, or at least not own (for otherwise he does, and has done as Impious things) the doing of that, which is so evidently injust. So that (if their own Principles be true) those Thirty thousand Masses could no way be profitable to that miserable deluded Person, in Purgatory, whither he was never to come; and I suppose, they will not say, that their Masses here, are profitable to the glorify'd Saints and Martyrs in Heaven.

12. And

(r) *Cum pœna pro culpis debitæ delentur & remittuntur, tum crimina delentur & remittuntur. Quo sensu Ecclesia per Indulgentias concedit peccatorum Omnium plenissimam veniam, id est, Pœnarum Omnium, quas peccando contraximus.—Quia non est Plene remissa Culpa, quamdiu peccator Reus est Solvendæ Pœnæ.* Melch. Canus Locorum Theol. lib. 12. cap. 13. §. Ex quo Ambrosij pag. 694. Edit. Colon. Agrip. 1605.

12. And here, (for a more clear and diſtinct Explication of their Jeſuitical and Popiſh Aſſaſſinations) it will neither be Impertinent nor Improper to obſerve further, That although ſince the time of *Hildebrand* or (*f*) *Gregory* the Seaventh, the Antichriſtian Pride or Tyranny of the Pope and his Party, has been exceeding great, and pernicious to the Weſtern Part of the World; they both approving and practiſing the Excommunications and Depoſitions of Kings and Emperors, Abſolutions of their Subjects from all Oaths of Allegiance, with Injunctions (againſt the Law of Nature and Scripture) never to Obey them: yet I do not find that the Popes or their Party approv'd or practis'd the Aſſaſſinations of Princes before *Ignatius Loyola*, and the unhappy Approbation and Confirmation of his Society, *Ann.* 1540. Nay, I find it Condemned, as Impious, Inhuman, and Barbarous; not only by their Learned men, (even their Canoniſts) but by their Popes and Councils. That this may appear, I deſire it may be conſider'd,

1. That Pope *Innocent* the Fourth, about the year 1245. or 1246. makes a (*t*) Conſtitution in the General Council at *Lions*, (and with the (*u*) *approbation* of that Council) wherein he calls Aſſaſſinations (x) *Horrid Inhumanity*, and *Deteſtable Cruelty*. and an indeavour to *kill Body and Soul:* and then adds, *That if any Prince or Prelate, any Perſon Eccleſiaſtical or Civil, ſhall procure any Aſſaſſin to kill any Chriſtian, (though the Effect do not follow) or receive, conceal, or any way favour*

Obſerv. 12.

(*f*) It was the ſaying of this *Gregory*, *Intelligant Omnes, Imperia, Regna, Principatus, & quicquid habere mortales poſſunt, auferre & dare Nos Poſſe.* Plat. in vitâ Greg. 7. Edit. 1485. And *Baronius* tells us, that this, and ſuch dictates of that Pope —— *In Eccleſia Catholica Hactenùs uſurpati ſunt.* Annal. Tom. 11. ad Ann. 1076. §. 31.

(*t*) Conſtitutio illa extat, in Corpore Juris Can. de Homicidio. cap. pro humani. 1. In. 6.

(u) *Sacri approbatione Concilij Statuimus.* Ibid.

(x) *Qui Horrenda Impietate Deteſtandaque Sævitiâ Mortem ſitiunt aliorum, ut Ipſos faciunt per Aſſaſſinos occidi, non ſolum Corporum, ſed mortem procurent Animarum —— Statuimus, ut quicunque Princeps vel Prælatus quempiam Chriſtianorum per prædictos Aſſaſſinos interfici fecerit, vel mandaverit (quanquam mors non ſequatur) Excommunicatus & Depoſitus à Dignitate, Honore, & Officio, Ipſo facto, ſit bonis etiam Mundanis Omnibus à toto Chriſtiano populo perpetuo diffidatus.* Ibid. & Conc. Tom. 11. Part. 1. p. 672. Edit. per Labbe Pariſ. 1671.

favour ſuch Aſſaſſin, then ſuch Perſon is (Ipſo facto) Excommunicate, Depoſed, and Deprived of all his Honour, Dignity and Revenue. This was the Judgment of Pope *Innocent* the Fourth about 435. years ſince; and although for Antichriſtian Pride and Tyranny (as in other things, ſo) in his Impious Excommunication and Depoſition of the Emperor *Frederick*, he was as bad as his Predeceſſors; yet neither they nor he, were (as yet) arrived at the height of Impiety to approve Mahometan and Turkiſh Aſſaſſinations of Kings and Emperors.

2. About Eight and forty years after the making of this Conſtitution by *Innocent* the Fourth, *Boniface* the Eighth (as Impious and Tyrannical as his Predeceſſors, was made Pope, and approved this Conſtitution of *Innocent* againſt Aſſaſſinations, and referr'd it into the Body of their (*y*) Canon Law; where it ſtill (*z*) remains in all Editions of that Law, even to this Day: and that (to give (*a*) Authority to it) with the Approbation and Confirmation of ſucceeding Popes; particularly of *Pius* the Fourth, *Pius* the Fifth, and *Gregory* the Thirteenth.

3. And hence it is, that eminent Writers of the Church of *Rome* (except the Jeſuites and their Party) do, even to this Day, generally Condemn all ſuch Aſſaſſinations, as Impious, and to the Publick Pernicious. This evidently appears (to ſay nothing of the Gloſs) by Cardinal (*b*) *Turrecremata*, Cardinal (*c*) *Cajetan*, Cardinal

(*y*) Cap. *pro humani.* 1. De Homicidio, In. 6. Decretalium.

(*z*) Vid. Edit. Juris Canonici, Pariſ. 1612. & 1618. Lugduni. 1661. &c.

(*a*) *Ut hujus utiliſſimi & graviſſimi Codicis non vacillaret Authoritas, placuit Pio. 4. dein Pio. 5. & Greg. 13. ut illi Corrigendo Summa opera daretur, &c.* Ita admonitio ad Lect. præfixa Corpori Juris Can. Pariſ. 1612. & Ludg. 1661.

(*b*) Summa de Eccleſia, l. 25. 35. & 36. as he is cited (for I have not the Book by me) in the Margent of the Canon Law; ad Cap. 1. de Homicidio. in. 6.

(*c*) In Summula. verbo Aſſaſſinus.

dinal (*d*) *Tuſchus*, *Henry* (e) *Spondanus* (Biſhop of *Pamiez* in *France*,) *Didacus* (f) *Couvarruvias* (Biſhop of *Segobia* in *Spain*, &c.) And here it is further obſervable, 1. That Pope *Innocent* the Fourth, in the aforeſaid Decretal Conſtitution, ſpeaks only of thoſe Ancient, and properly ſo call'd *Mahometan-Aſſaſſins*; and though he cenſures their Aſſaſſinations as Impious, yet he appoints not their Puniſhment. I know that the Author of the Gloſs upon that Conſtitution (*Joh. Andreas Bononienſis*, was the man) tells us; (g) *That the Puniſhments expreſs'd there, are denounc'd againſt the Aſſaſſins, as well as thoſe who procur'd or hired them to Aſſaſſinate any Chriſtians.* But the man is miſerably miſtaken; for 'tis Evident, and (*h*) Confeſs'd, *That the Puniſhments contain'd in the Conſtitution, are denounced only againſt thoſe Chriſtians who hire and imploy thoſe Impious Aſſaſſins.* Excommunication (and the Conſequents of it) is the Puniſhment mention'd in that Conſtitution; which neither did, nor poſſibly could concern thoſe Mahometan Aſſaſſins. For although the ſaid Author of the Gloſs, elſewhere tells us, *That the Pope is* (i) *more then a pure man; and Gods Vice-Roy*; yet certainly, he cannot do Impoſſibilities, and Excommunicate Mahometans and Infidels; unleſs he can turn thoſe out of the Chriſtian Church, who never were, nor would be in it; and deprive them of that Communion, which they never had. But although Pope *Innocent* the Fourth (in the afore-mention'd Conſtitution)

(*d*) Concluſ. Pract. Juris, Lit. A. verbo Aſſaſſinus. Concluſ. 531.

(*e*) Continuat. Annal. Baronij, ad Ann. 1231. §. 3. 4. 5. &c.

(*f*) Operum, Tom. 1. p. 528. De Delict. & Conat. §. 9.

(g) *Papa volens obviare huiuſmodi malis, profert plures pœnas in iſtos Aſſaſſinos, & illos qui eis mandabant.* Gloſſa ad dictum Cap. 1. De Homicidio. In. 6.

(h) *Non contra ipſos Aſſaſſinos, utpote Infideles, ſed contra Mandantes per Ipſos aliquem occidi; Innocentius. 4. Excommunicationem promulgavit.* Cajetan. in Summula. verbo Aſſaſſinus.

(i) *Papa cum prius eſſet Purus Homo, nunc Vices Veri Dei gerit.* Johan. Andreas, in Gloſſa ad Proœmium. 6. Decret. verbo Bonifacius.

on) ſpeaks only of the Infidel and Mahometan Aſſaſſins, and of thoſe Chriſtians who procure or hire them to Murder Princes, and has nothing of any other, who are not of that Mahometan Society; though they undertake and act the ſame Villanies; yet thoſe Great and Learned Canoniſts and Writers of the Popiſh Church (before-named) upon proportion and parity of Reaſon, juſtly Condemn all Chriſtians who ſhall undertake and effect, or indeavour ſuch Aſſaſſinations. Of theſe Chriſtian Aſſaſſins, Cardinal *Cajetan* ſays — (k) *That though they be not comprehended under the Cenſures of that Conſtitution, yet they Deſerve both a Temporal and Eternal Death.* And to the ſame purpoſe *Covarruvias* tells us, (and he ſays it is the Common Opinion) (l) *That whoſoever he be (Chriſtian or Mahometan) who for Money given or promiſed, undertakes the Aſſaſſination of any Chriſtian; in this Caſe, both the Mandans and Mandatarius, both he that hires, and he who is hired to do ſuch Villany, are highly guilty, and under the Cenſures, and the Severity of them: though he who is hired, do not actually effect the Aſſaſſination, if he really indeavour it.* Nor is it only theſe I have named, who Damn this Impious, Mahometan and Turkiſh Doctrine of Aſſaſſinating Kings and Princes. I believe, and (from good Authority) know, that many thouſands more in the Communion of the Church of *Rome* do equally abhorr and deteſt it, eſpecially in *France*, where their Divines and Parliaments (famous for

(k) *Et hi non comprehenduntur ſub Cenſura dicta, quamvis digni ſunt & Morte Temporali & Æternâ.* Cajetan. Ibidem.

(l) *Qui cum quolibet Chriſtiano aut Infideli, pecunia data vel promiſſa pactionem inierit, de homine Chriſtiano occidendo, in ipſo Mandatario, ſi ad actum proximum proceſſerit, ut per eum minime ſteterit; quin ſcelus peregerit, notant puniendum fore pœna Ordinariâ; id eſt, Morte.* D. Covarruvias, Part. 2. Relect. Clem. *Si furioſus*, de Homicidio, de delictis & Conat. num. 9. Operum. Tom. 1. p. 258. Col. 1.

for Learning and their General Defence of the Liberties of the *Gallican Church*, againſt the Uſurpations and Tyranny of *Rome*) in the year 1594. publickly Condemn'd this Mahometan and Jeſuitical Doctrine, and declared it to be (what indeed it is) (m) *Heretical, Prodigious, and Diabolical.*

4. But all this notwithſtanding, the Jeſuites (and others of their Party and Principles) did, and do approve and practiſe that Diabolical Doctrine; and when they conceive Princes to be Enemies to their Intereſt, or the Catholick Cauſe, (as they call it) indeavour (by Lying Calumnies) to diſaffect the People, and to raiſe Rebellions againſt thoſe Princes; that ſo they may cut them off, by Publick War and Seditions; and when this ſucceeds not, by private Aſſaſſinations. This is (by ſad Experience) notoriouſly known to our Weſtern World; as may appear by the Premiſſes, and further Teſtimonies of their own *Roman Catholick Hiſtorians* (in this Caſe) of Indubitable Truth and Veracity. *Thuanus* tell us, (n) *That in thoſe Bloody Wars in* France, *in the Reign of* Henry *the Third; it was ſome of the Religious and Regulars, eſpecially the Jeſuites, who by an Induſtrious, and* (I add) *Impious Diligence, did firſt Alienate the People from their Obedience to their Prince, and then ſollicited them to Rebellion.* I know that thoſe words (*Ac Jeſuitarum Patrum Imprimis*) are not to be found in thoſe Editions of *Thuanus* we have, being left out by the Arts and Frauds of thoſe who corrupt

(m) Hen. Carter. Davila in his Hiſt. of the Civil Wars of France, ad Ann. 1594. in Calce iſtius Anni.

(n) *Accedente ad hoc Sacri ordinis favore & quorundam Religioſorum non ſegni Opera, & Jeſuitarum Patrum Imprimis, qui faſcinatum per ſcrupuloſas in Arcanis Confeſſionibus quæſtiones, plebem ſenſim a Principis obſequio alienatam, Ad Defectionem Sollicitabant.* Thuanus Hiſt. Tom. 3. lib. 75. p. 561. A. B. Edit. 1620. & Tom. 4. l. 86. p. 170. ad Ann. 1587. And the ſame excellent perſon (*Thuanus*) gives us this account of the Society of the Jeſuites.

Nata Magiſtratum convellere, nata Miniſtris
Subtrahere obſequium, præſulibuſque ſuum.
Et viles Regnantum animas, ipſoſque Necandos
Horrenda Regis proditione docet;
Servandamque fidem Negat, argutiſque cavillis
Detorquet magni juſſa ſevera Dei.

Hi ſunt Ampliſſ. Præſidis Thuani verſus de Jeſuitarum Secta, in Elegia ſua eleganti in Parricidas, ſub finem Sacræ Poeſeos.

rupt all Authors who have any thing against their Errors or Impieties; but we are assured that those words were in the (o) *Original Copy of Thuanus his History.* But when this would not do, and they saw the King could not be cut off by a Rebellious War, and publickly; they perswade and incourage *Jaques Clement* (a Desperate Villain) to Assassinate his Prince; who *August* the First, 1589. did the Execrable Act, and Murder'd his *King.* *Thuanus* tells us, (p) *That Friar* Clement *was incouraged to Commit that Prodigious Parricide by the furious Sermons and Declamations of their New Divines,* (q) *Especially of the Jesuites, who publickly taught them, That it was lawful, nay* (r) *Meritorious to kill a Tyrant, and if he outlived the Fact, he should be a Cardinal at* (s) Rome; *and if he died, a* (t) *Saint in Heaven. And accordingly when he was dead (by a Death he deserved) his Party caused his* (u) *Picture to be cut in Brass, adorned their Churches and Chambers with it, counted him a Saint and Martyr, and (as such) made their Addresses and Prayers to him. Horrid Superstition and Popish blindness,* not to put a vast difference between a *Martyr of Jesus Christ*, and an *Impious Traytor and Murtherer of his King.* 2. After this, in the year 1594. *Johan. Chastell* undertakes and indeavours the Assassination of *Henry* the Fourth of *France*, struck him in the Mouth, but (the good Providence of Heaven protecting that Prince) did not effect his Impious Design.

(o) Vide Thuanum Restitutum Amstoladami. Ann. 1663. p. 49.

(p) Thuanus Hist. Tom. 4. l. 95. p. 454. A. *Facundis Concionatorum Declamationibus, & Novitiorum, Theologorum, ac præcipuè Jesuitarum disputationibus, qui Tyrannum Impune occidere Licere affirmabant, Incitatus Clemens, &c.*

(q) Vide Thuanum Restitutum. p. 84.

(r) *Non solum inoffensa Conscientiâ facere posse, sed multum apud Deum Meriturum.* Thuanus dicto Tom. 4. & p. 454.

(s) Hen. Cart. Davila, in his Hist. of the Civil Wars in *France*, Lib. 10. ad Ann. 1589.

(t) *Si in actu Ipso moriatur, proculdubio inter Beatorum choros animam ejus Evolaturam.* Thuan. dicto Tom. 4. & p. 454. & Davila, l. 10. ad Ann. 1589.

(u) Historical Collections of the most Memorable Accidents, and Tragical Massacres in *France*, under Hen. 2. Francis. 2. Charles. 9. Hen. 3. and Hen. 4. ad Ann. 1589. in the beginning of Hen. 4. & Thuan. Tom. 4. ad dictum Ann. p. 458.

Deſign. Now if you ask, How any who pretends to be a Chriſtian, could have a Conſcience ſo ſeared, or a Soul poſſeſs'd with ſo Prodigious an Inſenſibility, as not to tremble at the very thought of Committing ſuch a horrid and inhuman Villany? (*a*) *Davila* will tell you, *That he was a Diſciple of the Jeſuites; That he himſelf freely confeſſed, that he was bred up in the Schools of the Jeſuites, and had often heard it diſcours'd, and diſputed, That it was not Only Lawful, but Meritorious to Kill* Henry *of* Bourbon, *a Relapſed Heretick, and Perſecutor of the Holy Church; That Father* Gueret *a Jeſuite, was his Confeſſor, &c. ſo that being poſſeſs'd with their Impious Principles and Perſwaſions, he undertook that prodigious and damnable Parricide.* In ſhort, it was notoriouſly known to all *France*, that the Jeſuites both approved and deſigned the Execrable Aſſaſſination of their King. Whence it was, (as *Davila* goes on) *that the Parliament of* Paris *paſs'd this Sentence — That Father* Guignard *and* Gueret (*Jeſuites*) *ſhould be Condemned to the Gallows; that the reſt of the Jeſuites* (*profeſs'd or not profeſs'd*) *ſhould be baniſhed out of* France, *as Enemies to the Crown and publick Tranquility, their Goods and Revenues ſeiz'd and diſtributed to pious Uſes, &c.* And it had been well for *France* had they ſtood baniſhed ſtill, and never return'd. For about Sixteen years *after*, what *Johan. Chaſtell* impiouſly indeavour'd, that bloody Villain *Raviliac*, *May* the Fourteenth, 1610. effected; and with Monſtrous

(*a*) Hen. Carter. Davilà, in his Hiſtory of the Civil wars of *France*, lib. 14. ad Ann. 1594. ſub finem iſtius Anni. See to the ſame purpoſe the Author of the Civil Wars of *France* under Hen. 2. Fran. 2. Charl. 9. Hen. 3. and Hen. 4. In Henry the Fourth, ad Ann. 1594. a little before the end of that year.

ſtrous Impiety, and a Curſed hand Murder'd his King, *Henry* the Fourth; And it was the Jeſuites, and their Traiterous Principles, which moved and incouraged him to Commit that Monſtrous Unchriſtian and Antichriſtian Parricide. For (after the Fact was done) *Raviliac* freely and publickly confeſſed, *That it was the Jeſuite* Mariana's *Book which moved and incouraged him to that Impious Deſign.* I know that the Jeſuites did then indeavour to (*b*) *free themſelves* from the Odium of that Impious Fact; as if they had neither approved nor incouraged that Monſtrous and Mahometan Aſſaſſination. *Sed quid verba audiam, cum facta videam?* This (*c*) was only a ridiculous indeavour, *Æthiopem Lavare*, to waſh a Blackamore, and do Impoſſibilities. It is evident, *That their approved Doctrine and Principles in* Mariana, (*and many others*) *was the Motive which induced* Raviliac *to Murder his Prince.* Which Doctrine has never been Condemned by any Publick Act of their Society, nor by the Inquiſitors in any *Index Expurgatorius*; now for them to approve thoſe Traiterous Principles, and deny the Conſequents of them, is moſt irrationally to approve and grant the Premiſſes, and yet deny the Concluſion.

(*b*) See Father *Cotton*, the Jeſuites Declaration, with the Biſhop of *Paris* his Preface prefixed to it, to this purpoſe.

(*c*) See *Anti-Cotton* by *Peter Du Moulin.*

5. But this (though bad enough) is not all. For it is not only the Jeſuites and their Accomplices, but the Pope too, (their Supream Judge, whom they (*d*) believe to be Infallible, both in Matters of Faith and Fact) who approved their Seditious

(d) *Chriſtus Petro & Succeſſoribus Eccleſiæ regimen Commiſit, & Eandem quam habebat Ipſe, Infallibilitatem Conceſſit, quoties è Cathedra Loquerentur. Datur, Ergo, in Rom. Eccleſiâ, Controverſiarum Fidei Judex Infallibilis, etiam extra Concilium Generale, tum in Quæſtionibus Juris, tum Facti.* Hæc erat Theſis in Coll. Claromontano à Jeſuitis propoſita & expoſitâ Decem. 12. Ann. 1661.

Seditious and Traiterous Principles of Rebellion and Aſſaſſination of Princes. *Thuanus* ſpeaking of the Jeſuites Practices to ſtir up the People to Rebellion in the time of *Henry* the Third of *France*; he adds —(e)*That theſe things were well known to the Pope, who ſent Breves and Bulls ſecretly to the Heads of thoſe Rebels, whereby they were incouraged to Rebel.* Afterwards, when that Prodigious Villain *Jaques Clement* had Murder'd the ſaid King, (f) *Sixtus* the Fifth then Pope, did not only *approve the Fact, but (in a premediated Oration, publickly ſpoke in the Conſiſtory) blaſphemouſly compares it (in reſpect of its greatneſs and amiableneſs) to our bleſſed Saviours Incarnation and Reſurrection: and then highly Commends the Murderer (for his Virtue, Courage, and Zealous Love of God) above* Eleazar *and* Judith, &c. *And* (to omit the reſt) *pronounceth the Murder'd King Eternally Damn'd, as having Committed the* (g) *Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt.* This the Hiſtorian (though a Papiſt) modeſtly and juſtly Cenſures, as a Fact (*h*) *Extreamly Inſolent* and *Unworthy the Moderation of a Paſtor*, (eſpecially the Supream Paſtor of the Church, Chriſts Vicar, and St. *Peter*'s Succeſſor, as they call him). And then he tells us of *Anti-Sixtus*, (or the Anſwer to Pope *Sixtus* his Oration) and ſays, 1. *That it had been more for the* (i) *Credit of the Pope and the Holy Apoſtolick Sea, that his Oration had been ſuppreſs'd, then (as it was by thoſe of the League) Publiſhed.* 2. *That* Anti-Sixtus (*or the Anſwer to it*) *though it was ſomething*

(e) *Quæ Omnia Conſcio Pontifice gerebantur, crebro Commeantibus ad eum Emiſſariis, qui Brevia & occulta Diplomata ad partium Duces adferebant, & indies magis plebem ad ſeditionem incendebant.* Vid. Thuanum Reſtitutum. p. 49.

(f) *Sixtus Papa. 5. Oratione præmeditata. 3. Idus Sept. in Conſiſtorio habita, factum Clementis Operi Aſſumptæ à Domino Carnis, & Reſurrectionis, propter magnitudinem, & rei adminiſtrationem comparat. Tum virtutem hominis, animi Robur, & ferventem Erga Deum Amorem, ſupra Eleazarum & Juditham, Multis verbis, Extollit, &c.* Thuan s Hiſt. Tom. 4. li. 95. ad Ann. 1589. p. 458. Edit. 1620.

(g) *Peccato in Spiritum Sanctum admiſſo, quale erat Regis peccatum.* Ibid. p. 458. E.

(*h*) Thuanus ibidem. *Summè Inſolens,* & Paſtoris moderatione indignum.

(i) *Supprimi potius quam publicari, famæ Sixti & Sanctæ Sedis Interfuit.* Ibidem.

ſharp and bitter, (k) *yet the Popes Oration abundantly deſerved it, in which were Many Things Abſurd and Impious.* This was the Judgment of that Faithful and Excellent Hiſtorian, (though a Papiſt) concerning the Erroneous and Impious Principles of the Pope and Jeſuites.

(k) *Reſponſio acerbior, ſed tali Oratione prorſus Digna, in qua Multa Abſurda & Impia notantur.* Ibidem.

6. Nor is this all; For although, only privately to approve and incourage Rebellion and Aſſaſſination of Kings and Princes, be an Execrable Villany, to be abhorr'd by all men (eſpecially Chriſtians) as being repugnant to that clear Light of Nature and Scripture, to common Reaſon and Religion; yet in Publick Writings to vindicate and juſtifie ſuch Actions, to perſwade the World, *that they are not only morally good, but meritorious:* This argues a higher degree of Impiety and Impudence. We know (by ſad Experience) that many Pagans and Chriſtians have blaſphem'd their Gods, committed Adulteries, Murders, Perjuries, &c. yet we do not find, that any Chriſtians, (the Jeſuites and their Accomplices excepted) or any ſober Pagan (who acknowledg'd a God) did ever juſtifie Blaſphemy, Adultery, Murder, or Perjury; but when they were Apprehended, Convict and brought to Execution, they would confeſs the Crime, pray for Pardon, and deſire others to pray for them. But the Jeſuites (and thoſe poſſeſs'd with their Principles) though they be Convict, and Legally Condemn'd for Rebellion and Aſſaſſination of Princes,

Princes, yet they neither do, nor can repent; believing ſuch Actions not to be any Vices, but Vertues, and themſelves (if they ſuffer for them) not Traytors or Murderers, but Holy Martyrs. That this is their approved and received Doctrine, which they publickly defend, and induſtriouſly (in their Publick Writings) indeavour to juſtifie, is evident to the Weſtern World, and may appear by the Premiſſes. Yet being a thing of ſuch great concern, (omitting *Mariana*, *Emanuel Sa*, *Sanctarellus*, and others before mentioned) I ſhall only add Two or Three Eminent Teſtimonies, in further confirmation of it. Firſt then, *Fran.* (l) *Suarez*, Publick and Prime Profeſſor of Divinity in the Univerſity of *Conimbra* in *Portugal*, handling that Point, how, and in what Caſes a Tyrant may, (by any private Perſon) be Murder'd: And having told us, that a Tyrant was either, 1. *Tyrannus* (m) *Titulo*; one who, (without any juſt Title) uſurp'd the Government, to the ruine of the Common-weal. 2. *Tyrannus* (n) *Adminiſtratione*; one who having a juſt Title, ruled Tyrannically. And he there tells us, *That all Chriſtian* (o) *Kings are ſuch Tyrants, who induce their Subjects to Hereſie, Apoſtaſie, or Schiſm.* So that all Proteſtant Princes (we may be ſure) are ſuch Tyrants, though he there name only King *James* of happy Memory. Having Premiſed this, he gives the ſtate of the Queſtion: Thus,

(l) Fran. Suarez in Defenſ Fidei Cathol. adverſus Angl. Sectæ Errores cum Reſponſ. ad Apolog. Jacobi Regis, &c. Colon. Agrip. 1614. l. 6. c. 4. pag. 814. &c.

(m) *Tyrannus titulo, qui vi, & injuſtè Regnum occupat, qui Revera Rex non eſt, ſed locum illius occupat.* Ibid. §. 1.

(n) *Qui licet juſto Titulo Regnum poſſideat, quoad uſum tamen & gubernationem, Tyrannice regnat.* Ibid.

(o) *Inter Chriſtianos, Maxime eſt numerandus in hoc Ordine Princeps, qui Subditos ſuos in Hæreſin, aut aliud Apoſtaſiæ genus, aut Schiſma inducit.* Ibid. §. 2. p. 811. Col. 1.

1. He

1. He does (in the General) give us two Cases, wherein it is Lawful for a Subject to kill his King. 1. *In defence of his* (p) *own Life.* If a King invade *Sempronius* to kill him, *he may, in defence of his own life, take away the Kings.* 2. *In defence of the* (q) *Commonwealth.* This in the General. But then

2. For a *Tyrant in Title*, he absolutely declares it, as a thing (r) commonly received amongst them; *That such a Tyrant may be lawfully kill'd, by Any Private Person, who is a Member of that Commonwealth, if there be no other Means to free it from such a Tyranny.* And least it should not be observ'd, 'tis set in the (f) Margent, *That such a Tyrant may Lawfully be kill'd.* So that the Case is (with him) out of all doubt, *That any private man may kill a Tyrant in Title; and the Pope is Judge who is such a Tyrant.* Whence it evidently follows, *That no Princes can have any Security (as to the Preservation of their Kingdoms or Lives) longer then they please the Pope.* For if he declare any of them Tyrants, (as many times, with Execrable Pride and Impiety, he has done) Excommunicate and Depose them; then by this Jesuitical and Papal Doctrine, any Private Person, (any of their Subjects especially) may Assassinate and Murder them.

3. For those Princes who have a *just Title* to their Dominions, and are (as they call them) *Tyrants not in Title*, but in their Injustice and Impious Government: He tells us

1. *The*

(p) *Si defensio sit propriæ vitæ, quam Rex violenter auferre aggreditur, tunc quidem Ordinarie licebit Subdito, seipsum defendere, etiamsi Mors Principis sequatur, quia jus tuendæ vitæ est Maximum, &c.* Ibid. p. 815. B.

(q) *Si Rex Actu aggrediatur Civitatem, ut Cives perdat, &c. tunc certe licebit Principi resistere, Etiam Occidere Illum, si aliter fieri defensio, &c.* Ibid. §. 6. C. *Tunc enim Civitas habet justum bellum defensivum, Contra Injustum Invasorem, Etiamsi Proprius Rex sit.* Ibidem. D.

(r) *Communiter asseritur Tyrannum quoad Titulum, Interfici posse, à Quacunque privata Persona, quæ sit Membrum Reipubl. quæ Tyrannidem patitur, &c.* Ibid. §. 7. F.

(f) *Tyrannus in Titulo Licite Occiditur.* Ibidem. §. 7. Margine.

1. *That* (t) *all Proteſtant Princes being Hereticks are ſuch Tyrants.* 2. *That being Hereticks, they are by their* (u) *Hereſie*, Ipſo facto, *and preſently deprived* (aliquo modo) *in ſome manner, of all Right to their Dominions.* 3. *That the Pope* (*as their* (x) *Superior, to whom even Supream Princes are Subjects*) *may totally and abſolutely depoſe and deprive them of all their Dominions and right to Govern.* 4. *When the Pope has paſs'd ſuch Sentence, and deprived them of their Dominions; if afterwards they meddle with the Government, they become every* (y) *way Tyrants* (*both* Titulo & Adminiſtratione). And then, 5. *After ſuch* (z) *Sentence paſs'd by the Pope, ſuch Kings or Supream Princes may be dealt with, as Altogether, and Every Way Tyrants, and Conſequently may be kill'd by Any Private Perſon.*

(t) *Inter Chriſtianos Maximè in hoc Ordine* (*Tyrannorum ex Adminiſtratione Tyrannicâ*) *numerandus eſt Princeps, qui Subditos in Hæreſin aut aliud Apoſtaſiæ Genus, aut publicum Schiſma Inducit.* Ibid.c.4.§.1.

(u) *Rex Hæreticus Statim per Hæreſin ipſo Facto privatur, Aliquo Modo, proprietate & Dominio Regni ſui.* Ibid c.4. §.14.p.819.

(x) *In ſummo Pontifice eſt hæc poteſtas tanquam In Superiori habente Juriſdictionem ad Corripiendum Reges, etiam Supremos, tanquam Sibi Subditos,&c.* Ibidem.

(y) *Si Rex poſt depoſitionem Legitimam, in ſua pertinacia perſeverans, Regnum per vim retineat, incipit eſſe Tyrannus in Titulo, quia non eſt Legitimus Rex, nec juſto Titulo Regnum poſſidet.* Ibidem.

(z) *Ergo Extunc poterit Rex tanquam Omnino Tyrannus Tractari; & Conſequenter A Quocunque Privato Poterit Interfici.* Ibidem.p.819.B.

4. And though theſe be Prodigious Errors, Unchriſtian, and indeed Antichriſtian Impieties; ſuch as neither ours, nor any Language can fully expreſs; yet this is not all: The Jeſuite further declares, *That though* (a) *Pagans anciently had, and ſtill have Power, to Depoſe their Tyrannical Kings; yet in Chriſtian Commonwealths, they have ſuch dependence upon the* (b) *Pope, that*

(a) *Reſpublica* (*prout inter Gentiles, & nunc inter Ethnicos*) *habet poteſtatem, ſe defendendi à Rege Tyranno, & illum deponendi ſi neceſſarium fuerit, &c.* Ibid.§.17.p.820.A.

(b) *Regna Chriſtiana quoad hoc* (*ſcilicet depoſitionem Regum ſuorum*) *habent dependentiam & ſubordinationem ad Pontificem Romanum; qui poteſt Regno præcipere, ut ſe Inconſulto, Regem non deponat, niſi prius Cauſa & Ratione Ab Ipſo Cognita propter pericula, & Animarum diſpendia, quæ in his Tumultibus populariibus Intervenium.* Ibid. A.

with-

without his Knowledge and Authority, they should not depose their King: For he may Command and Prohibit the People to do it. And he gives Instances, when People have consulted the Popes, and by their Counsel and Consent Deposed their Kings. *So* (he says) (*c*) *Chilperick was Deposed in France, and Sancius Secundus in Portugal.* And (to make up their Errors and Impieties full) he further tells us, —(*d*) *That all Christian Kingdoms and Commonwealths do so far depend upon the Pope, that he may not only Counsel the People, and Consent to their Deposition and Assassination of their Tyrannical Princes; But he may Command and Compel them to do it, when he shall think it fit, for avoiding Schisms and Heresies: That is indeed, for the rooting out and ruine* of the true *Protestant Religion*, and establishing their *Roman Superstition and Idolatry.* And to conclude, he further declares, *That* (in such Cases) *the Popes Command* (to Murder a Deposed King) *is so far from being any Crime, that it is* (e) *Superlatively Just.* I might here cite Cardinal (*f*) *Tolet, Guliel.* (g) *Rossæus*, and a hundred such others, who approve, and in their Publicks Writings (Approved and Licenced, according to the Decree of their (*h*) *Trent* Council, by the *Authority of their Church*) justifie this Impious and Antichristian Doctrine of Deposing and Assassinating Heretical Kings: but this I conceive a needless work. For, 1. *Suarez* himself declares it to be the received Doctrine of their Church, and cites many of their

(*c*) Ibidem. p. 820. C.

(d) *Pendet Regnum Christianum à Pontifice in hoc, ut posset Pont. non solum Consulere, aut Consentire, ut Regem sibi perniciosum deponat, sed etiam Præcipere, & Cogere ut id faciat, præsertim cum ad vitandas Hæreses & Schismata necessarium esse Judicaverit.* Suarez. Ibid. p. 820. B.C.

(e) *Quia tale præceptum in illo Casu Justissimum est.* Idem Ibidem.

(*f*) Instruct. Sacerd. l. 5. c. 6. §. 17. p. 738.

(*g*) G. Rossæus de Justa Reipub. Christiana in Impios, &c. Authoritate. Cap. 3.

(*h*) Conc. Trident. Sess. 4. in Decreto de Editione & usu Sacrorum librorum.

their Eminent Writers to prove it; which, any may ſee, who is not ſatisfied with theſe before cited. 2. The Licencers of *Suarez* and his Book are (for Dignity in their Church and for Learning) ſo great, and (for Number) ſo many, and the Commendations they give *Suarez* and his Work ſo high, that there neither is, nor can be any juſt Reaſon to doubt, but this Doctrine was approved at *Rome*, and by the Ruling part of that Church (the Pope and his Party) believed and incouraged, as a Doctrine aſſerting the Popes Extravagant, and (as they call it) *Supernatural* (i) *Power*, and ſo their Common Intereſt. Let the Reader conſult the Cenſures prefix'd to *Suarez* his Book, and he will find all theſe following to Approve and Licence it. Firſt, Three great Biſhops, all of them Counſellors to his Catholick Majeſty. 2. Two Provincials of the Society; one of the Jeſuites in *Portugal*, the other of thoſe in *Germany*. 3. *Academia, Complutenſis*, the Univerſity of *Alcala de Henares* approves it too. 4. Laſtly, the (*k*) *Supream Senate* (Court or Congregation) of the Inquiſitors, do alſo approve and licence it, and this they do by (*l*) Commiſſion from *Peter de Caſtello, Vice-Roy of Portugal, and in Matters of Faith Supream inquiſitor.* The Premiſſes impartially conſider'd, I think we may truly ſay, That it is not only *Suarez*, or ſome particular or private Perſons, but the Church of *Rome*, and her Ruling part, which approves this Impious and Trayterous

(i) *Firmis & Inconcuſſis Argumentis Poteſtatem Summi Pontificis Supernaturalem tuetur.* Ita in Cenſurâ Illuſt. D.D. Alphon. A Mello, Epiſc. Lamecenſis, Suareſij Libro præfixa.

(k) *Facultas Supremi Senatus S. Inquiſitionis.*

(l) *Ex Commiſſione Illuſtriſſimi Epiſcopi, D. Petri de Caſtillo, Luſitaniæ Proregis, & Supremi in rebus Fidei Inquiſitoris.* In Cenſura Alphonſi à Caſtello, Epiſc. Conimbricenſis, à Conſiliis Catholicæ Majeſtati.

Doctrine: Which may further appear (besides their Approbations and Licences) from the great Commendations they give *Suarez* and his Book and Doctrine. And here

1. For *Suarez*; They say, (m) *That he was a Contemner of Humane things, and a most Valiant Defender only of Piety and Catholick Religion: And (for his Excellent Wisdom) the Common Master, and another* Augustine *of that Age.— That for his great Zeal for the Catholick Faith, he was a most Famous Author, and a most Eminent Divine. That he was a* (n) *Most Grave, and most Religious Writer; whose Works the World,* (the Popish World) *does Honour, Admire, and Love, &c.*

(m) *Humanarum rerum Religiosus Contemptor, & Unius Pietatis & Religionis fortissimus Defensor, & propter Eximiam Sapientiam, Communis hujus ætatis Magister, & Alter Augustinus.*

(n) *Religiosissimus juxta ac Gravissimus Auctor, cujus Ingenii monumenta, Orbis Suspicit, Miratur, Amat.*

2. And for his Book, and the Doctrine contained in it, They say, *That all* (o) *things in his Book, are Religiously Consonant to Sacred Scripture, to Apostolical Traditions, General Councils, and Papal Decrees*; (this last we admit, and they profess it to be true). And hence, if they may be believed, who expressly affirm it themselves, it evidently follows, That this Traiterous Doctrine is approved by the Pope, and is Consonant to his Decrees. And those Publick Censors of *Suarez* his Book severally add; *That they find* (p) *Nothing* (and therefore not the Assassinations of Kings) *in it, against the Orthodox Faith,* (the Roman Faith they mean) *but many things which do defend the Faith.* The University of *Alca-*

(o) *In qua non Solum S. Scripturæ Authoritati Omnia Religiosè Consonant, Apostolicis traditionibus Pie Correspondent, Oecumenicis Conciliis, Summorum Pontificum Decretis eruditè consentiunt.*

(p) *Quâ in defensione Nihil Planè offendi, quod Fidem Offendat, quæ vero defendant, Inveni Multa.* So it is in the Censure of *Ferdinand Martinez* Counsellor to his Catholick Majesty.

la de (q) *Henares* (to omit the reſt) more fully teſtifies—*That they read* Suarez *his Book with all poſſible Diligence, and found Nothing in it repugnant to the Catholick Faith; nor was there Any Thing in it which ought not to be Approved and Commended.* And then add, (that we may be ſure they ſpoke cordially and deliberately) *That there was Nothing in that whole Work, which All of them did not approve; ſo that they were All of the ſame Mind and Judgment.* Nay, we are further told, *That he had Compoſed that Work, by* (r) *More then Human Helps; and therefore they Judge it* (ſ) *Moſt Worthy to be Publiſhed, for the Publick, and Common Benefit of the Whole Chriſtian World, and a Signal Victory of their Faith over Hereſies.* Such are the Commendations of *Suarez* his Book and Doctrine; ſo that we may be ſure that it is Approved and Received at *Rome.*

And here let me further add, that when King *James* had Publiſhed his Apology for the *Oath of Allegiance*, and Sir *Henry Savil* Tranſlated it into Latin; the Latin Copy was (by the Popiſh Party) immediately ſent to *Rome*, and (by the Pope) (t) *Condemned* there, as Impious and Heretical: From *Rome* it was ſent to *Suarez*, who (by the Popes Command) was to Confute and Anſwer it. He undertook and finiſhed the Anſwer, ſent it to *Rome*, where it was highly approved, and afterwards Printed and Publiſhed with all thoſe Approbations and Commendations before mention'd. But theſe Poſitions need no further proof,

(q) *Librum Suareſij quanta potuimus diligentiâ, evolvimus, in quo opere Nihil veritate Catholicæ fidei Alienum, Nihil dcvium, Nihil diſſonum deprehenditur: Nihil quod probari laudaríque non debeat. Denique Nihil à Noſtro Omnium Senſu diſcordans, cum hac in re, ſit Omnium noſtrum Eadem vox, Idem Animus, Eadémque Sententia.*

(r) *Pluſquam Humano Studio. In Cenſura Alphon. A Caſtello, Epiſ. Conimbricenſis.*

(ſ) *Digniſſimum ut in Lucem eat, ad Fidei Noſtræ Victoriam De Hæreſibus Inſignem, & totius Orbis Chriſtiani Publicam & Communem utilitatem.* In Cenſura Illuſtriſſ. D. D. Alphonſ. A Mello. Epiſc. Lamec. A Conſiliis Cathol. Majeſtati.

(t) By Pope *Paul.* 5. who in his damnatory Breve, ſays — *Juramentum illud, ſalva fide Catholica, & Salute Animarum, præſtari non poteſt; cum Multa Contineat, quæ fidei ſaluti Aperte Adverſantur.* Vide Remonſtrant. Hibernorum, per R. Caron. p. 9.

that they are own'd and publickly approved by the Pope and his Party. I ſhall only add; When King (*u*) *James* had charged *Bellarmine* and the Church of *Rome*, with this Rebellious and Impious Doctrine, of depoſing Kings, abſolving Subjects from all Oaths of Allegiance and Fidelity, &c. (*x*) *Gretſer* in his Anſwer, has theſe memorable words—(*y*) *We do not deny*, (ſays he) *but freely Profeſs, that the Pope, upon juſt cauſe*, (and he is Judge of that) *may Excommunicate and Depoſe Princes, and Abſolve their Subjects, from their Oath of Allegiance.* And then he adds—(*z*) *That the Subjects are bound in Conſcience to Obey the Popes Sentence; not only in the Caſes mentioned, But in* (*a*) *All other of the like Nature.* And this impious and traiterous Doctrine of *Gretſer*, is not only approved by (*b*) *the Provincial of the Jeſuites* in *Germany*, and the Rector and Vice-Chancellor of the Univerſity of *Ingolſtade*; but his whole Book (and ſo thoſe mentioned, and many more ſuch Rebellious and Impious Poſitions) *Was Approved at* Rome, *by the Suffrage of Moſt Learned Divines.* This the ſaid Provincial of the Jeſuites, and the (*c*) Rector of the Univerſity of *Ingolſtade* expreſly teſtifie, in their Publick and Printed Approbations of *Gretſers* Book. The Premiſſes, and Traiterous Popiſh Principles conſider'd, (which are received and believed at *Rome*) though men may (*d*) wonder at the Beaſt, (the Pope and his Party) and that any, (who would not only be thought Chriſtians, but the only Catholicks in the World) ſhould maintain, and publickly juſtifie ſuch Principles: yet we need not wonder

(*u*) In Apolog. pro Juramento fidelitatis.

(*x*) In Commentario Exegetico contra Jac. Regem. Ingolſtadij, An. 1610.

(*y*) *Non diſſitemur, ſed Libere Profitemur, quod Papa, ſuppetente legitima Cauſa poſſit, Principes Excommunicare, Deponere, Subditos à Juramento Fidelitatis Exſolvere*, &c. Gretſer Ibid. p. 255.

(*z*) *Subditi in Conſcientia tenentur ſtare Sententiæ Pontificis.* Ibidem.

(*a*) *Et ſi qui ſint Alij Caſus Hujus Generis.* Ibid.

(*b*) Ibidem. p. 11. Apolog. Jac. Gretſeri, Romæ, à Deputatis ad id Theologis lectam & approbatam, ego quoque Theod. Bu æus Approbo, &c.

(*c*) *Hunc Librum Jac. Gretſeri, Doctiſſimorum Theologorum Suffragiis Romæ Approbatum, ego iisdem Approbo, ut quamprimum, Antipharmaci loco, ſparſis ex Britannia Venenis, opponatur, opto ego Petrus Steuartius, Academiæ Ingolſtadienſis Pro-Cancellarius, & hoc tempore Rector.* Ibid. p. 12.

(*d*) Rev. 13 3.

wonder, that ſuch Perſons ſhould practiſe and act according to ſuch Principles, and continually indeavour (eſpecially after the Anathema of *Pius* the Fifth) by Rebellions at home, and Invaſions from abroad, to rob Queen *Elizabeth* of her Crown and Kingdoms, and of her Life too, by Roman and Mahometan Aſſaſſinations. I ſay, we need not wonder at this. For let the aforeſaid Doctrines (which they approve and conſtantly contend for) be granted, (*That the Pope is Supream Judge and Monarch of the World (directe or indirecte) that all Kings and Emperors are His Subjects, that he has Power to Depoſe and Deprive them of their Kingdoms, that when he has Judicially deprived them, any Private Perſon may Murder them; that he has Power to Abſolve their Subjects from all Obligations and Oaths of Allegiance, and to Command them, upon pain of an Anathema never to obey any of their Princes Laws or Commands; that the People may depoſe their King, with His Conſent and Counſel; and that he may Command and Compel them to do it; and this ſo* (d) *oft as he ſhall Think it Good for the Spiritual Health of the*

(d) *Poteſt Pontifex non ſolum Conſulere, aut Conſentire, ut Regnum Regem ſuum ſibi pernicioſum Deponat; ſed etiam Præcipere, & Cogere, ut id Faciat; quando Saluti Spirituali Regni, & præſertim ad vitandas Hæreſes neceſſarium eſſe Papa Judicaverit.* Suarez dicto. l. 6. cap. 4. p. 820. B, C. This place is before cited, but that the Reader may not be troubled to look back for it, I have again put it here. Where in the Margent, (which I before omitted) *Suarez* cites others, (to ſhew he was not ſingular in this Opinion) Azorius, Tom. 3. l. 2. c. 7. Quæſt. 30. A Caſtro, lib. 2. De juſta Hæreticorum Punitione; cap. 14. vid. Hiſt. Conciliorum General. per Ed. Richerium Doctorem Sorbonicum, lib. 1. cap. 13. §. 3. p. 398. Colon. 1680. where he acknowledges that *Bellarmine, Suarez, Becanus*, and the Jeſuites maintain this Doctrine of Depoſing and killing Kings —— *Jeſuitæ non modo docent, Papam habere poteſtatem Regum Abdicandorum verum etiam & Capite Puniendorum in Officio Sacræ Inquiſitionis, ut vocant, &c.* And the ſame *Sorbon* Doctor, Ibidem. cap. 8. §. 13. pag. 191. tells us, that 'tis the Jeſuites Doctrine; *Licere Pontifici Reges ſibi immorigeros, haud aliter Abdicare, quam Paſtor Canes, quos minus habet ad manu, Occidere.* And that it is their Practiſe, to accuſe thoſe Princes who do not pleaſe them, to the People, of Tyranny, Schiſm or Hereſie, *Hacque viâ Illos tanquam aretes, aut Canes Furioſos, Parricidis mactandos Exponere.*

King-

Kingdom. (Prodigious Error and Impiety! as if Rebellion, Aſſaſſinations and Murdering their Kings, conduc'd to the Salvation of the Subjects.) I ſay, theſe Erroneous and Impious Doctrines granted, and (as they are at *Rome*) believ'd, it is certain, that (ſo far as they have opportunity and ability) they will (as they ever have done) proſecute their Intereſt, and practiſe according to thoſe Principles; and all Chriſtian Kings will be in perpetual danger to looſe their Crowns, their Kingdoms, and their Lives too; unleſs they can pleaſe the Pope, and become his dutiful Servants, and indeed Slaves to his Anti-Chriſtian Tyranny. I ſay no Chriſtian King, *Tros Tyriuſve*, Papiſt or Proteſtant can be out of eminent Danger, where ſuch Doctrine is, by ſuch Doctors maintain'd. We have ſad and certain Inſtances of this Truth: For, 1. *Henry* the Third and Fourth of *France* were neither *Calviniſts* nor *Lutherans*, but declared Sons of the *Roman Synagogue*; yet becauſe they did not Comply with the Popiſh Intereſt, in that degree and meaſure, the Pope and his Party expected, they fatally fell by the Traiterous and Prodigious Villany of bloody Aſſaſſins, *Ridente & gaudente Roma*; The Pope and his Jeſuitical Party, (with an Extaſie of Joy) Approving and Commending the Treaſon, and (in their Writings and Pictures) Canonizing the Traitors. 2. For Proteſtants, and (as they call them) Heretical Princes, their danger (proportionable to *Romes* hatred of them) is greater. They may (by

(by the Power and Gracious Providence of God) want ability, but they neither do, nor (unleſs they renounce their Erroneous and Impious Principles) ever will want a deſire and indeavour to ruine thoſe they call Hereticks, either by open Hoſtility and Rebellions, or by Poyſon, Piſtols, and private Aſſaſſinations. Their many known Plots and Conſpiracies againſt Queen *Elizabeth*, King *James*, *Charles* the Martyr, and his Gracious Majeſty now Reigning, (whom God preſerve) are undeniable Demonſtrations of this Truth. The Ark of God and Dagon, Light and Darkneſs, Truth and Error, the Bible and Popiſh Bullary, Proteſtancy and Popery cannot poſſibly Conſiſt, and be in Peace. Nothing is (or can be) ſo deſtructive of Darkneſs and Error, as Truth and Light; And 'tis evidently known to this Weſtern World, That the Evangelical Light and Truth, which the Proteſtants have happily and clearly diſcovered, to the long deluded Church of God, have awakened thouſands, to a deteſtation of that Superſtition and Idolatry, under which they formerly lay, to the diſhonour of God, and ruine of their Souls, and to a ſhaking and great diminution of the Papal Monarchy and Tyranny; ſo many Kingdoms forſaking *Rome*, and ſhaking off the Heavy and Intollerable Yoke of Sin and Popiſh Servitude. *Et hinc illæ Lacrymæ*; Hence it is, that the Pope, and his inraged Party, when they cannot, by any probable pretence of Reaſon confute, what they call Hereſie, (the Proteſtant Religion) they indeavour to Confound and

(by

(by Fire and Sword) Consume the Hereticks—*Æterna bella, pace sublatâ, gerunt, Jurant odium, nec prius hostes esse desinunt, quam esse desinunt.* They excite and incourage (e) *Princes of their Profession,* to persecute and destroy all Protestants in their Dominions; and their barbarous and bloody Poet has told us, how they desire it to be done;

Utere Jure Tuo Cæsar, *Sectámque* Lutheri
Ense, Rota, Ponto, Funibus, Igne neca.

Use thy Power *Cæsar*, let *Lutherans* be slain,
By Fire, Rack, Halter, Sword, or drown'd ith' Maine.

(e) This is evident (to omit others) by the Bull of Pope *Paul* the Third, wherein King *Hen.* 8. is Excommunicated and Deposed. For in that Bull having declared that King an Heretick and deposed him; he commands all Christian Princes (Kings or Emperor) to take Arms against K. *Henry* and his Adherents ——*Insuper, tam Principes, prædictos (quacunque etiam Imperiali aut Regali dignitate fulgentes. §. 15.) quam quoscunque alios, etiam ad stipendia quorumcunque Christi fidelium militantes & alias quascunque personas, tam Per Mare quam Per Terras, Armigeros habentes, eis Mandantes, ut contra Henricum Regem, eique adhærentes, dum in erroribus adversus Sedem prædictum permanserint, Armis Insurgant, eosque & eorum singulos Persequantur, &c.* And then (such is his liberality) he gives those Souldiers all the Goods of those Anathematiz'd Hereticks, wherever they can find them ——*Eorumque Bona, Mobilia, & Immobilia, Mercantias, Navigia, Credita, Res, & Animalia, etiam extra territorium Henrici Regis, Ubi Libet Consistentia, Capiant, &c.* Vide Pauli Papæ. 3. Constit. 7. datum Romæ, Decemb. 17. Ann. Dom. 1538. Pontificatus sui, Ann. 5. In Bullario Romano, Romæ 1638. Tom. 1. p. 516. Col. 2. §. 16.

DAM-

668.9:32

DAMNATIO
ET
EXCOMMUNICATIO
Henrici VIII.
REGIS
ANGLIÆ
EJUSQUE
FAUTORUM;
Cum aliarum
ADJECTIONE POENARUM.

Paulus Episcopus, Servus Servorum Dei.

Ad futuram Rei Memoriam.

Æditæ. A. D. 1535. & 1538.

EJUS *qui immobilis permanens, sua Providentia, Ordine mirabili dat cuncta moveri, disponente* Clementiâ, *vices, licet immeriti gentes in Terris, & in Sede Justitiæ Constituti, juxta quoque Prophetæ* Hieremiæ *vaticinium*

 dicentis:

Exordium.

dicentis: Ecce Te Conſtitui ſuper Gentes, & Regna, ut evellas, & deſtruas, ædifices, plantes, præcipuum ſuper Omnes Reges Univerſæ Terræ, cunctoſque populos obtinentes Principatum, ac illum qui pius, & miſericors eſt, & vindictam ei, qui illam prævenit paratam temperat, nec quos Impœnitentes videt ſevera ultione Caſtigat, quin prius Comminetur, in aſſidue autem peccantes, & in peccatis perſeverantes, cum Exceſſus Miſericordiæ fines præteriunt, ut ſaltem metu pœnæ ad Cor reverti cogantur, Juſtitiæ vires Exercet, imitantes, & Incumbenti Nobis Apoſtolicæ ſolicitudinis ſtudio perurgemur, ut cunctarum Perſonarum noſtræ Curæ Cœlitùs Commiſſarum ſalubri Statui ſolertius Intendamus, ac Erroribus, & Scandalis, quæ hoſtis Antiqui verſutia imminere conſpicimus, propenſius obviemus, Exceſſuſque, & Enormia, ac ſcandaloſa Crimina congrua ſeveritate Coerceamus, & juxta Apoſtolum inobedientiam ovium promptius ulciſcendo, illorum perpetratores debitâ Correctione ſi Compeſcamus, quod eos Dei iram provocaſſe pœniteat, & ex hoc aliis Exemplum Cautelæ ſalutaris accedat.

Henricus poſtquam à Leone decimo Titulo Defenſoris Fidei donatus fuit, ex Cauſa hic expreſſa, à Catholica fide deviavit, & multa enorma commiſit.

Sect. 1. *Sane cum Superioribus Diebus nobis relatum fuiſſet, quod* Angliæ *Rex, licet Tempore Pontificatûs Fel. recor.* Leonis *Papæ decimi Prædeceſſoris noſtri diverſorum Hæreticorum Errores ſæpe ab Apoſtolica Sede, & Sacris Conciliis præteritis Temporibus damnatos, & noviſſimè Noſtra Ætate per Perditionis Alumnum* Martinum Lutherum *ſuſcitatos, & innovatos, Zelo Catholicæ Fidei, & Erga dictam Sedem, devotionis fervore inductus, non minus doctè, quam piè per quendam Librum per eum deſuper Compoſitum*

&

& *eidem* Leoni *Prædeceſſori*, *ut eum Examinaret*, *approbaret*, *oblatum Confutaſſet*, *ob quod*, *ab eodem* Leone *Predeceſſore*, *Ultra dicti Libri cum magna Ipſius* Henrici *Regis Laude & Commendatione*, *approbationem*, *Titulum Defenſoris Fidei reportaverit*, *à rectâ Fide & Apoſtolico tramite devians*, *ac propriæ ſalutis*, *famæ & honoris immemor*, *Poſtquam Cariſſima in Chriſto Filia noſtra* Catherina Angliæ *Regina*, *Illuſtri ſua Progenie Conjuge*, *cum qua publicè in facie Eccleſiæ Matrimonium Contraxerat*, & *per plures Annos Continuaverat*, *ac ex qua*, *dicto conſtante Matrimonio prolem pluries ſuſceperat*, *nulla Legitima ſubſiſtente Cauſa*, & *contra Eccleſiæ Prohibitionem dimiſſa*, *cum quadam* Anna Bolena, *Muliere* Anglica, *dicta* Catherina *adhuc vivente*, *de facto Matrimonium Contraxerat*, *ad deteriora proſiliens*, *quaſdam Leges*, *ſeu Generales Conſtitutiones edere*, *non erubuit*, *per quas*, *ſubditos ſuos ad quoſdam Hæreticos*, & *Schiſmaticos Artículos tenendos*; *Inter quos & hoc erat*, *quod Romanus Pontifex Caput Eccleſiæ*, & *Chriſti Vicarius non erat*, & *quod ipſe in* Anglicâ *Eccleſiâ Supremum Caput Exiſtebat*, *ſub Gravibus etiam mortis pœnis cogebat*. *Et his non Contentus*, *Diabolo Sacrilegij Crimen ſuadente*, *quamplures Prælatos etiam Epiſcopos*, *aliáſque Perſonas Eccleſiaſticas*, *etiam Regulares*, *necnon Seculares ſibi ut Hæretico*, & *Schiſmatico adhærere*, *ac Articulos prædictos ſanctorum Patrum decretis*, & *ſanctorum Conciliorum ſtatutis*, *immo etiam Ipſi Evangelicæ veritati contrarios*, *tanquam tales alios damnatos approbare*, & *ſequi nolentes*, & *intrepidè recuſantes capi*, & *carceribus mancipari*. *Hiſque*

similitèr non Contentus, mala malis accumulando, bonæ mem. Jo. H. S. vitalis Presbyter Cardinalis Roffen. *quem ob Fidei Constantiam, & vitæ sanctimoniam, ad Cardinalatus Dignitatem promoveramus, cum dictis Hæresibus & Erroribus consentire nollet, horrendâ immanite & detestanda sævitiâ, publicè* Miserabili *supplicio tradi, & decollari mandaverat, & fecerat Excommunicationis, & Anathematis, aliásque gravissimas sententias, censuras, & pœnas in Literis, ac Constitutionibus recolendæ mem.* Bonifacij *Octavi,* Honorij *Tertij, Roman. Pontificum Prædecessorum Nostrorum desuper Editis Contentas, & alias in tales à jure latas damnabilitèr incurrendo ac Regno* Angliæ, *& Dominiis, quæ tenebat, necnon Regalis fastigiis Celsitudine, ac præfati Tituli prærogativâ, & honore se Indignum reddendo.*

Clemen. 7. (ejus Constit. hic non habes) tandem illum Excommunicavit, quin in Censuris infordescendo deterior evasit.

Sect. 2. *Nos licet ex eo, quod prout non Ignorabamus, Idem* Henricus *Rex in Certis Censuris Ecclesiasticis quibus à Piæ Memoriæ* Clemente *Papa Septimi etiam Prædecessore nostro, postquam humanissimis literis, & paternis Exhortationibus, multísque Nunciis, & mediis, Primo & Postremo, etiam Judicialiter, ut præfatam Annam à se dimitteret, & ad Prædictæ* Catherinæ *suæ veræ Conjugis Consortium rediret frustra monitus fuerat, innodatus Extiterat,* Pharaonis *duritiam imitando, per Longum Tempus in Clavium Contemptum Insorduerat, & Insordescebat, quod ad Cor rediret vix sperare posse videremus ob Paternam tamen Charitatem, qua in minoribus Constituti donec in Obedientiâ, & Reverentia Sedis prædictæ permansit, eum prosecuti fueramus, útque clarius videre*

dere Poſſemus, an Clamor qui ad nos delatus fuerat (quam certè etiam Ipſius Henerici *Reſpectum falſum eſſe diſiderabamus) verus eſſet, ſtatuimus ab ulteriori contra Ipſum* Henricum *Regem proceſſu ad Tempus abſtinendo, hujus Rei veritatem diligentius Indagare.*

Sect. 3. *Cum autem debitis diligentiis deſuper factis clamorem ad Nos, ut præfertur, delatum, verum eſſe, ſimúlque, quod dolenter referimus, dictum* Henricum *Regem ita in Profundum malorum deſcendiſſe, ut de Ejus Recipiſcentiâ nulla penitùs videatur ſpes haberi poſſe, reperimus. Nos attendentes veteri Lege Crimen Adulterij notatum, lapidari Mandatum, ac Auctores Schiſmatis hiatu terræ abſorptos, eorúmque ſequaces Cæleſti Igne Conſumptos,* Elimámque *Magum viis Domini Reſiſtentem per Apoſtolum Æterna ſeveritate damnatum fuiſſe, volenteſque ne in diſtricto Examine Ipſius* Henrici *Regis & Subditorum ſuorum, quos ſecum in Perditione trahere videmus, Animarum Ratio à Nobis Expoſcatur, quantum Nobis ex alto conceditur providere contra* Henricum *Regem, Ejúſque Complices, Fautores, Adhærentes & ſequaces; & in Præmiſſis quomodolibet culpabiles, contra quos, ex eo quod Exceſſus, & delicta prædicta adeo manifeſta ſunt, notiora, ut nulla poſſint tergiverſatione celari abſque ulteriori morâ ad Executionem procedere Poſſemus, benignius agendo, decrevimus infraſcripto modo procedere.*

Ideo Pont. Iſte contra Regem, Complices, & Fautores decrevit, procedere, ut hic.

Sect. 4.

Regem itáque hortatur, ut ab hujuſmodi erroribus deſiſtat.

Sect. 4. *Habita itáque ſuper his cum venerabilibus Fatribus Noſtris S. R. E. Cardinalibus deliberatione maturâ, & de Illorum Conſilio, & Aſſenſu præfatum* Henricum *Regem, Ejuſque Complices, Fautores, Adhærentes, Conſultores & Sequaces, ac quoſcúnque alios in Præmiſſis, ſeu eorum aliquo quoquomodo Culpabiles, tam Laicos, quam Clericos, etiam Regulares, cujuſcúnque Dignitatis, Status, Gradus, Ordinis, Conditionis, Præeminentiæ, & Excellentiæ exiſtant (quorum Nomina, & Cognomina perinde ac ſi Præſentibus Interſererentur, pro ſufficienter expreſſis haberi volumus) per viſcera Miſericordiæ Dei Noſtri hortamur, & requirimus in Domino, quatenus* Henricus *Rex à prædictis Erroribus prorſus abſtineat, & Conſtitutiones, ſeu Leges prædictas, ſicut defacto eas fecit, revocet, Caſſet, & annullet, & Coactione Subditorum ſuorum ad eas Servandas, necnon Carceratione, Captura, & Punitione illorum, qui ipſis Conſtitutionibus. ſeu Legibus Adhærere, aut eas ſervare noluerint, & ab aliis Erroribus prædictis penitus, & Omnino abſtineat, & ſi quos Præmiſſorum occaſione Captivos habeat, relaxet.*

Complices vero & Fautores monet ut abſtineant Regi deſuper favere, vel adhærere.

Sect. 5. *Complices verò, Fautores, Adhærentes, & Sequaces dicti* Henrici *Regis in præmiſſis, & circa ea Ipſi* Henrico *Regi ſuper his de cetero non adſiſtant, nec adhæreant, vel faveant, nec ei Conſilium, Auxilium, vel Favorem, deſuper præſtent.*

Sect. 6.

Sect. 6. *Alias ſi* Henricus *Rex, ac Fautores, Adhærentes, Conſultores, & Sequaces hortationibus, & requiſitionibus hujuſmodi modi non audiverint cum Effectu,* Henricum *Regem, Fautores, Adhærentes, Conſultores & Sequaces, ac alios Culpabiles prædictos, Authoritate Apoſtolicâ, ac ex certâ noſtra Scientiâ, & de Apoſtolicæ Poteſtatis Plenitudine tenore Præſentium in virtute Sanctæ Obedientiæ, ac ſub Majoris Excommunicationis Latæ Setentiæ, à quà etiam prætextu cujuſcúnque Privilegij, vel facultatis, etiam in forma Confeſſionalis, cum quibuſcúnque efficaciſſimis Clauſulis à Nobis, & Sede prædicta quomodolibet Conceſſis, etiam iteratis vicibus innovatis, ab alio quam à Romano Pontifice, præterquam in mortis Articulo Conſtituti, ita tamen, quod ſi aliquem abſolvi contingat, qui poſtmodum Convaluerit, niſi poſt Convaleſcentiam, Monitioni, & Mandatis noſtris hujuſmodi paruerit cum Effectu, in eandem Excommunicationis Sententiam reincidat) abſolvi non poſſint.*

Inobedientéſque Majoris Excommunicationis ſententia innodat.

Sect. 7. *Necnon Rebellionis, & quoad* Henricum *Regem, etiam Perditionis Regni, & Dominiorum Prædictorum, & tam quoad eum, quam quoad alios Monitos ſupradictos, ſupra & infra ſcriptis pœnis, quas ſi dictis Monitione & Mandatis, ut præfertur, non paruerint, eos, & eorum ſingulos, Ipſo facto reſpectivè incurrere volumus, per Præſentes Monemus; eiſque, & eorum cuilibet diſtrictè præcipiendo Mandamus, quatenus* Henricus *Rex per ſe, vel Procuratorem Legitimum, & ſufficienti Mandato ſuffultum,*

Rebellionis quoque, & Amiſſionis Regni pœnam Imponit. Regémque & Complices monet, ut infra, certum Terminum Compareat alioquin in pœnas hic expreſſas incidiſſe declarat.

Infra

Infra Nonaginta, Complices vero, Fautores, Adhærentes, Conſultores & Sequaces, ac alij in Præmiſſis quomodolibet Culpabiles ſupradicti, Seculares & Eccleſiaſtici, etiam Regulares, Perſonaliter, Infra Sexaginta dies Compareant Coram Nobis, ad ſe ſuper Præmiſſis legitimè Excuſandum, & Defendendum, alias videndum, & Audiendum Contra eos, & eorum ſingulos etiam Nominatim, quos ſic Monemus, quatenus expediat, ad Omnes, & ſingulos Actus, etiam Sententiam Definitivam, Declaratoriam, Condemnatoriam, & Privatoriam, ac Mandatum Excuſativum procedi. Quod ſi Henricus *Rex, & alij Moniti Prædicti Intra dictos terminos eis, ut præfertur, reſpectivè præfixos, non Comparuerint, ad Prædictam Excommunicationis Sententiam per tres dies, poſt Lapſum dictorum Terminorum Animo, quod abſit, ſuſtinuerint Indurato, Cenſuras Ipſas aggravamus, & ſucceſſive reaggravamus,* Henricúmque *Regem Privationis Regni, & Dominicorum prædictorum, & tam eum, quam alios Monitos Prædictos, et eorum ſingulos, Omnes et ſingulas alias pœnas prædictas Incurriſſe, ab omnibúſque Chriſti Fidelibus, cum eorum bonis, perpetuo diffidatos eſſe. Et ſi Interim ab humanis decedat, Eccleſiaſtica debere carere Sepulturâ, Auctoritate et Poteſtatis Plenitudine prædictis decernimus, et Declaramus, eóſque Anathematis, Maledictionis, et Damnationis Æternæ mucrone percutimus.*

Et quaſcunque Civitates Eccleſias & alica Loca, ad quæ Ipſi declinaverint, Interdicto Eccleſiaſtico ſupponit.

Sect. 8. *Necnon quæ præfatus Rex* Henricus *quomodolibet, et ex quavis Cauſa tenet, habet, aut poſſidet, quam diu* Henricus *Rex, et alij Moniti prædicti,*

dicti, & eorum ſinguli in aliis per dictum Henricum *Regem non tentis, habitis, aut poſſeſſis permanſerint, & Triduo poſt eorum inde receſſum, & alia quæcunque, ad quæ* Henricum *Regem, & alios monitos prædictos poſt Lapſum dictorum Terminorum declinare contigerit, Dominia, Civitates, Terras, Caſtra, Villas, Oppida, Metropolitanáſque, & alias Cathedrales, ceteráſque Inferiores Eccleſias, necnon Monaſteria, Prioratus, Domos, Conventos, & Loca Religioſa, vel Pia Cujuſcunque, etiam S.* Benedicti, Cluniacen. Ciſtercien. *Præmonſtraten. ac Prædicatorum, Minorum, Eremitarum. S.* Auguſtini, Carmelitarum, *& aliorum Ordinum, ac Congregationum, & Militarium quarumcunque in Ipſis Dominiis, Civitatibus, Terris, Caſtris, Villis, Oppidis, & Locis Exiſtentiâ, Eccleſiaſtico ſupponimus Interdicto; ita ut illo durante in illis etiam prætextu cujuſcunque Apoſtolici Indulti Eccleſiis, Monaſteriis, Prioratibus, Domibus, Conventibus, Locis, Ordinibus, aut Perſonis, etiam quacunque Dignitate Fulgentibus Conceſſi, præterquam in Caſibus à jure permiſſis, ac etiam in illis alias quam Clauſis Januis, & Excommunicatis & Interdictis Excluſis, nequeant Miſſæ, aut alia Divina Officia Celebrari.*

Sect. 9. *Et* Henrici *Regis, Complicúmque, Fautorum, Adhærentium, Conſultorum, Sequacium, et Culpabilium prædictorum Filij, Pœnarum ut hic in hoc Caſu par eſt, participes ſint, Omnes et ſingulos ejuſdem* Henrici *Regis ex dictâ Annâ, ac ſingulorum aliorum prædictorum Filios natos, et naſcituros, alioſque deſcendentes, uſque in eum gradum, ad quem*

Filióſque eorum de dignitatibus, gratiis & privilegiis ac dominiis & bonis omnibus privatos, & ad alia de cetero obtinenda inhabiles eſſe declarat.

Jura pœnas in Casibus hujusmodi extendunt (Nemine excepto, nullâque minoris ætatis, aut Sexus, vel Ignorantiæ, vel alterius cujusvis Causæ habitâ ratione) Dignitatibus et Honoribus in quibus quomodolibet Constituti Existunt, seu quibus gaudent, utuntur, potiuntur, aut muniti sunt, necnon Privilegiis, Concessionibus, Gratiis, Indulgentiis, Immunitatibus, Remissionibus, Libertatibus, et Indultis, ac Dominiis, Civitatibus, Castris, Terris, Villis, Oppidis, et Locis, etiam Commendatis, vel in Gubernium Concessis, et quæ in feudum, emphyteusim, vel alias à Romanis, vel aliis Ecclesiis, Monasteriis, et Locis Ecclesiasticis, ac Secularibus, Principibus, Dominiis Potentatibus, etiam Regibus et Imperatoribus, aut aliis Privatis, vel publicis Personis quomodolibet habent, tenent, aut Possident, Ceteríque Omnibus bonis, Mobilibus et immobilibus, Juribus et Actionibus, eis quomodolibet Competentibus privatos, dicta bona feudalia, vel emphyteutica, et alia quæcunque, ab aliis quomodolibet obtenta, ad directos Dominos, ita ut de illis libere disponere possint, Respectivè devoluta, et eos qui Ecclesiastici fuerint, etiamsi Religiosi existant, Ecclesiis etiam Cathedralibus, et Metropolitanis, necnon Monasteriis et Prioratibus, Præposituris, Præpositatibus, Dignitatibus, Personatibus, Officiis, Canonicatibus, et Præbendis, aliisque Beneficiis Ecclesiasticis per eos quomodolibet obtentis, privatos, et ad alia, ac alia in posterum obtinenda Inhabiles esse, simplicitèr decernimus, et declaramus; eósque sic respectivè Privatos, ad alia et alia quæcunque similia, ac dignitates, honores, administrationes, et officia, jura, ac feuda in Posterum ob-

obtinenda, Auctoritate et Scientia, ac Plenitudine ſimilibus Inhabilitamus.

Subditóſque à juramento fidelitatis & ſubjectione liberat. Et eiſdem mandat ut ab obedientia omnino recedant.

Sect. 10. *Ipſiúſque* Henrici *Regis, ac Regni omniúmque aliorum Dominiorum, Civitatum, Terrarum, Caſtrorum, Villarum, Fortaliciorum, Arcium, Oppidorum, & Locorum ſuorum, etiam de facto obtentorum, Magiſtratus, Judices, Caſtellanos, Cuſtodes, & Officiales quoſcunque, necnon Communitates, Univerſitates, Collegia, Feudatarios, Vaſſallos, Subditos, Cives, Incolas, & Inhabitatores etiam Forenſes, dicto Regi de facto Obedientes, tam Sæculares, quam ſi qui rationis alicujus temporalitatis Ipſum* Henricum *Regem in Superiorem recognoſcant, etiam Eccleſiaſticos, à Præfato Rege, ſeu Ejus Complicibus, Fautoribus, Adhærentibus, Conſultoribus, & Sequacibus ſupradictis deputatis, à juramento fidelitatis, jure vaſſilitico, & omni erga Regem, & alios prædictos ſubjectione abſolvimus, ac penitùs liberamus, eis Nihilominùs ſub Excommunicationis pœna Mandantes, & ab ejuſdem* Henrici *Regis, ſuorúmque Officialium, Judicum, & Magiſtratuum quorumcúnque. Obedientiâ penitùs, & omnino recedant, nec illos in Superiores recognoſcant, neque illorum Mandatis obtemperent.*

Henrico & Complicibus alias pœnas hic Expreſſas Imponit.

Sect. 11. *Et ut alij eorum Exemplo perterriti, diſcant ab hujuſmodi Exceſſibus abſtinere, eiſdem Auctoritate, Scientiâ & Plenitudine, volumus, & decernimus, quod* Henricus *Rex, & Complices, Fautores, Adhærentes, Conſultores, Sequaces, & alij in præmiſſis Culpabiles, Poſtquam alias pœnas*

prædictas, ut præfertur respectivè incurrerint, necnon Præfati descendentes, extunc Infames existant, & ad Testimonium non admittantur, Testamenta, & Codicillos, aut alias dispositiones, etiam Inter vivos concedere, & facere non possint, & ad alicujus Successionem ex Testamento, vel ab Intestato, necnon ad Jurisdictionem, seu Judicandi Potestatem, & ad Notariatus Officium, Omnesque Actus Legitimos quoscunque (ita ut eorum Processus, sive Instrumenta atque alij Actus quicunque, nullius sint Roboris, vel momenti) Inhabiles existant; & Nulli Ipsis, sed Ipsi aliis super quocunque debito, & Negotio, tam Civili quam Criminali, de jure respondere teneantur.

Christi fidelibus sub pœnis hic expressis præcipit, ut Infidelium Commercium evitent.

Sect. 12. *Et Nihilominus Omnes, & singulos Christi fideles, sub Excommunicationis, & aliis Infrascriptis pœnis, monemus, ut monitos, Excommunicatos, aggravatos, interdictos, privatos, maledictos, & damnatos prædictos evitent, & quantum in eis est, ab aliis evitari faciant, nec cum eisdem, seu Præfati Regis Civitatum, Dominiorum, Terrarum, Castrorum, Comitatuum, Villarum, Fortaliciorum, Oppidorum, & Locorum prædictorum Civibus, Incolis, vel Habitatoribus, aut Subditis, & Vassallis, Emendo, Vendendo, Permutando, aut quamcunque Mercaturam, seu Negotij Exercendo, Commercium, seu aliquam Conversationem, seu Communionem habeant, aut vinum, granum, sal, seu alia victualia, arma, pannos, merces, vel quasvis alias Mercantias, vel Res per Mare in eorum Navibus, Triremibus, aut aliis Navigiis, sive per Terram cum Mulis, vel aliis Animalibus deferre, aut Conducere, seu deferri, aut*

aut Conduci facere, vel delata per illos recipere, pulicè vel occultè, aut talia facientibus auxilium, consilium, vel favorem, publicè, vel occultè, vel indirectè quovis quæsito colore, per se, vel alium, seu alios quoquomodo præstare præsumant, quod si fecerint, ultra Excommunicationis prædictæ, etiam Nullitatis Contractuum, quos inirent, necnon Perditionis Mercium, Victualium, & bonorum omnium delatorum, quæ Capientium fiant, pœnas similiter eo Ipso Incurrant.

Sect. 13. *Ceterum quia Convenire non videtur, ut cum his qui Ecclesiam Contemnunt, dum præsertim ex eorum pertinaciâ spes Corrigibilitatis non habetur, hi qui Divinis Obsequiis vacant Conversentur, quod etiam illos tutè facerè non posse dubitandum est, Omnium & singularum Metropolitan: & aliarum Cathedralium, Ceterarúmque Inferiorum Ecclesiarum, & Monasteriorum, Domorum, & Locorum Religiosorum & Piorum quorumcunque, etiam S.* Augustini, *S.* Benedicti, *Cluniacen. Cistercien. Præmonstraten. ac Prædicatorum, Minorum, Carmelitarum, alorúmque quorumcúnque Ordinum, & Militiarum, etiam Hospitalis* Hierosolymitani, *Prælatibus, Abbatibus, Prioribus, Præceptoribus, Præpositis, Ministris, Custodibus, Guardianis, Conventibus, Monachis, & Canonicis, necnon Parochialium Ecclesiarum Rectoribus, aliisque quibuscunque Personis Ecclesiasticis in Regno & Dominiis prædictis Commorantibus, sub Excommunicationis, ac Privationis administrationum, & Regiminum Monasteriorum, Dignitatum, Personatuum, Administrationum, ac Offi-*

Prælatis quóque & ceteris Personis Ecclesiasticis mandat sub pœnis hic contentis quatenus de Regno Angliæ discedant, ut hic.

Officiorum, Cannonicatuúmque, & Præbendarum, Parochialium Eccleſiarum, & aliorum Beneficiorum Eccleſiaſticorum quorumcunque quomodolibet qualificatorum, per eos quomodolibet obtentorum pœnis Mandamus, quatenus Infra quinque dies poſt Omnes & ſingulos Terminos prædictos Elapſos, de Ipſis Regno, & dominiis, dimiſſis tamen aliquibus Presbyteris in Eccleſiis, quarum Curam habuerint pro adminiſtrando Baptiſmate parvulis, & in Pœnitentia decedentibus, ac aliis Sacramentis Eccleſiaſticis, Quæ Tempore Interdicti Miniſtrari permittuntur, exeant, & diſcedant, neque ad Regnum, & Dominia prædicta revertantur, donec Moniti, & Excommunicati, aggravati, reaggravati, privati, maledicti, & damnati prædicti Monitionibus, & Mandatis noſtris hujuſmodi obtemperaverint, & meruerint à Cenſuris hujuſmodi abſolutionis Beneficium obtinere, ſeu Interdictum in Regno, & dominiis prædictis fuerit ſublatum.

Ducéſque & alios monet ſub pœnis ſupradictis, ut Henricum & ejus Complices de Regno expellere & expelli procurent.

Sect. 14. *Præterea ſi Præmiſſis non obſtantibus* Henricus *Rex, Complices, Fautores, Adhærentes, Conſultores, & Sequaces prædicti in eorum pertinacia perſeveraverint, nec Conſcientiæ ſtimulus eos ad Cor Reduxerit, in eorum forte Potentia, & armis Confidentes, Omnes & ſingulos Duces, Marchiones, Comites, & alios quoſcunque, tam Sæculares, quam Eccleſiaſticos, etiam forenſes, de facto dicto,* Henrico *Regi Obedientes, ſub ejuſdem Excommunicationis, ac Perditionis bonorum ſuorum (quæ, ut Infra dictus ſimiliter Capientium fiant) pœnis, requirimus, & monemus, quatenus Omni mora, & Excuſatione Poſtpoſita,*

poſita, eos & eorum ſingulos, ac Ipſorum Milites, & Stipendarios, tam Equeſtres, quam Pedeſtres, aliósque quoſcunque qui eis cum armis faverint, de Regno & Dominiis prædictis, etiam vi armorum, ſi Opus fuerit, expellant, ac quod Henricus *Rex, & ejus Complices, Fautores, Adhærentes, Conſultores, & Sequaces Mandatis noſtris non obtemperantes Prædicti de Civitatibus, Terris, Caſtris, Villis, Oppidis, Fortalitiis, aut aliis Locis Regni, & Dominij Prædictorum, ſe non Intromittant, procurent, Eis ſub Omnibus & ſingulis pœnis prædictis Inhibentes, ne in favorem* Henrici *ejúſque Complicum, Fautorum, Adhærentium, Conſultorum & Sequacium, aliorúmque Monitorum Prædictorum Mandatis Noſtris non obtemperantium, arma Cujuſlibet Generis offenſiva, & defenſiva, Machinas quoque bellicas, ſeu tormenta (artellarias nuncupata) ſumant, aut teneant, ſeu illis utantur, aut armatos aliquos, præter Conſuetam familiam parent, aut ab* Henrico *Rege Complicibus, Fautoribus, Adhærentibus, Conſultoribus, & Sequacibus, vel aliis in Regis Ipſius favorem paratos, quomodolibet, quavis occaſione vel Cauſâ, per ſe, vel alium, ſeu alios publicè vel occultè, directè vel indirectè teneant, vel receptent, aut dicto* Henrico *Regi, ſeu Illius Complicibus, Fautoribus, Adhærentibus, Conſultoribus, & Sequacibus Prædictis, Conſilium, Auxilium, vel quomodolibet ex quavis Cauſa, vel quovis quæſito Colore ſive Ingenio, publicè vel occultè, directè vel indirectè, tacitè vel expreſſè, per ſe vel alium ſeu alios Præmiſſis, vel aliquo Præmiſſorum præſtent, ſeu præſtari faciant quoquomodo.*

Sect. 15.

Principum Christianorum Confœderationes, & Obligationes Contractas cum Henrico nullas & invalidas declarat.

Sect. 15. *Præterea ad dictum* Henricum *Regem facilius ad ſanitatem, & præfatæ Sedis Obedientiam reducendum, Omnes & ſingulos, Chriſtianos Principes, quacunque etiam Imperiali & Regali Dignitate fulgentes, per viſcera Miſericordiæ Dei Noſtri (Cujus Cauſa agitur) hortamur & in Domino Requirimus, eis Nihilominùs, qui Imperatore & Rege Inferiores fuerint, quos propter Excellentiam Dignitatis à Cenſuris Excipimus, ſub Excommunicationis pœna Mandantes ne* Henrico *Regi Ejúſque Complicibus, Fautoribus, Adhærentibus, Conſultoribus, & Sequacibus, vel eorum alicui per ſe vel alium ſeu alios, publicè vel occultè, directè vel indirectè, tacitè vel expreſſe, etiam ſub prætextu Confœderationum aut Obligationum quarumcunque, etiam Juramento, aut quavis aliâ firmitate roboratarum, & ſæpius geminatarum, à quibus quidem Obligationibus, & Juramentis Omnibus, nos eos, & eorum ſingulos eiſdem Auctoritate & Scientia, ac plenitudine per præſentes abſolvimus, Ipſáſque Confœderationes & Obligationes tam factas, quam in Poſteram faciendas, quas tamen (in quantum* Henricus *Rex, & Complices, Fautores, Adhærentes, Conſultores, & Sequaces prædicti circa præmiſſa, vel eorum aliquod ſe directè vel indirectè Juvare poſſent ſub eadem pœna fieri prohibemus, nullius Roboris vel Momenti, nullásque, irritas, Caſſas, inanes, ac pro Infectis habendas fore decernimus & declaramus, conſilium, auxilium, vel favorem, quomodolibet, præſtent; quinimo ſi qui illis, aut eorum alicui ad præſens quomodolibet aſſiſtant ab Ipſis omnino,*

nino, & cum Effectu recedant. Quod ſi non fecerint poſtquam Præſentes publicatæ & Executioni demandatæ fuerint, et dicti Termini lapſi fuerint, Omnes & ſingulas Civitates, Terras, Oppida, Caſtra, Villas, & alia Loca eis Subjecta, ſimili Eccleſiaſtico Interdicto ſupponimus, volentes Ipſum Interdictum donec Ipſi Principes à Conſilio, Auxilio & Favore Henrico *Regi & Complicibus, Fautoribus, Adhærentibus, Conſultoribus, & Sequacibus prædictis præſtando, deſtiterint, perdurare.*

Principibus & aliis Mandat, ut contra Henricum & Complices Arma Capiant.

Sect. 16. *Inſuper tam Principes prædictos, quam quoſcunque alios, etiam ad Stipendia quorumcunque Chriſti fidelium Militantes, & alias quaſcunque perſonas, tam per Mare, quam per Terras, Armigeros habentes, ſimiliter hortamur, & requirimus, & nihilominùs eis in virtute Sanctæ Obedientiæ Mandantes, quatenus contra* Henricum *Regem, Complices, Fautores, Adhærentes, Conſultores, & Sequaces prædictos, dum in Erroribus prædictis, ac adverſus Sedem prædictam, rebellione permanſerint, Armis Inſurgant, eoſque & eorum ſingulos, perſequantur, ac ad Unitatem Eccleſiæ, & Obedientiam dictæ Sedis redire cogant, & compellant; & tam eos, quam Ipſorum Subditos, & Vaſſallos, ac Civitatum, Terrarum, Caſtrorum, Oppidorum, Villarum, & Locorum ſuorum Incolas, & habitatores, aliáſque Omnes ſingulas Perſonas ſupradictis Mandatis noſtris, ut præfertur, non obtemperantes, & quæ præfatum* Henricum *Regem Poſtquam Cenſuras & Pœnas prædictas incurrerit, in Dominum quomodolibet etiam de facto recognoverint, vel ei quovis*

modo obtemperare præſumpſerint, aut qui eum, ac Complices, Fautores, Adhærentes, Conſultores, Sequaces, ac alios non obtemperantes prædictos, ex Regno & Dominiis prædictis, ut præfertur, expellere noluerint, ubicúnque eos invenerint, eorúmque bona, mobilia & immobilia, mercantias, pecunias, navigia, credita, res, & Animalia, etiam extra territorium, dicti Henrici *Regis ubilibet Conſiſtentia, Capiant.*

Infideles & inobedientes capientium ſervos, & eorundem bona occupantium fieri decernit.

Sect. 17. *Nos enim bona, Mercantias, Pecunias Navigia, Res, & Animalia, prædicta ſic capta, In proprios eorum uſus convertendi, eiſdem Auctoritate, Scientia, & Poteſtatis Plenitudine, Plenariam Licentiam, Facultatem & Auctoritatem concedimus, illa omnia ad eoſdem Capientes plenariè pertinere, & ſpectare, & Perſonas ex Regno, & Dominiis prædictis Originem trahentes, ſeu in illis Domicilium habentes, aut quomodolibet habitantes, Mandatis noſtris prædictis non obtemperantes, ubicúnque eos Capi Contigerit, Capientium ſervos fieri decernentes, Præſentéſque Literas, quoad hoc, ad omnes alios cujuſcúnque Dignitatis, Gradus, Status, Ordinis, vel Conditionis fuerint, qui Ipſi* Henrico *Regi, vel ejus, Complicibus, Fautoribus, Adhærentibus, Conſultoribus, & Sequacibus, aut aliis Monitionibus, & Mandatis noſtris hujuſmodi, quoad Commercium non obtemperantibus, vel eorum alicui victualia, arma, vel pecunias ſubminiſtrare, aut cum eis Commercium habere, ſeu Auxilium, Conſilium, vel Favorem per ſe vel aliam, ſeu alios publicè vel occultè, directè vel indirectè,*

directè, quovis modo contra tenorem Præsentium præstare præsumpserint, extendentes.

Sect. 18. *Et ut præmissa facilius iis quos concernunt innotescant, universis & singulis Patriarchis, Archiepiscopis, Episcopis, & Patriarchalium Metropolitan. & aliarum Cathedralium, & Collegiatarum Ecclesiarum Prælatis, Capitulis, aliisque Personis Ecclesiasticis Sæcularibus ac quorumvis Ordinum Regularibus, necnon Omnibus, & singulis etiam Mendicantium Ordinum Professoribus Exemptis, & non Exemptis, ubilibet, Constitutis, per easdem Præsentes, sub Excommunicationis, & Privationis Ecclesiarum, Monasteriorum, ac aliorum Beneficiorum Ecclesiasticorum, Graduum quoque & Officiorum, necnon Privilegiorum, & Indultorum quorumcúnque etiam à Sede prædicta quomodolibet Emanatorum pœnis ipso facto Incurrendis, præcipimus, & mandamus, quatenus Ipsi, ac eorum singuli, si, & Postquam vigore Præsentium desuper requisiti fuerint, Infra tres dies Immediatè sequentes præfatum* Henricum *Regem, Omnesque alios & singulos, qui supradictas Censuras, & pœnas Incurrerint, in eorum Ecclesiis Dominicis, & aliis Festivis diebus, dum Major Imibi populi Multitudo, ad divina Convenerit, cum Crucis vexillo, pulsatis Campanis, & accensis, ac demum Extinctis, & in Terram projectis, & Conculcatis Candelis, & aliis in similibus servari solitis Cæremoniis servatis, Excommunicatos publicè nuncient, & ab aliis nunciari, ac ab Omnibus Arctius evitari faciant, & mandent, necnon sub supradictis Censuris & Pœnis, Præsentes*

Prælatis & aliis Mandat sub pœnis de quibus hic, ut in eorum Ecclesiis Henricum & Complices qui supradictas pœnas, & Censuras Incurrerint, Excommunicatos publicè enuncient, & evitari faciant.

Literas, vel earum transumptum, sub forma Infrascripta Confectum, Infra Terminum trium Dierum, Postquam, ut præfertur requisiti fuerint, in Ecclesiis, Monasteriis, Conventibus, et aliis eorum Locis, publicari, et affigi faciant.

Publicationem Istius Const. Impedientib. eadem pœnas Imponit.

Sect. 19. *Volentes, Omnes, et singulos cujuscúnque Status, Gradus, Conditionis, Præeminentiæ, Dignitatis, aut Excellentiæ fuerint, qui quominus Præsentes Literæ, vel earum transumpta, Copiæ seu Exemplaria, in suis Civitatibus, Terris, Castris, Oppidis, Villis, et Locis Legi, et affigi, ac publicari possint, per se, vel alium, seu alios, publicè vel occultè, directè vel indirectè impediverint, easdem Censuras, et Pœnas Ipso facto Incurrere. Et cum fraus et dolus nemini debeant Patrocinari, ne quisquam ex his, qui alicui Regimini, et Administrationi deputati sunt Infra Tempus sui Regiminis, seu Administrationis, Prædictas Sententias, Censuras, et Pœnas sustineat, quasi post dictum Tempus Seutentiis, Censuris et Pœnis prædictis amplius Ligatus non existat, quemcúnque qui dum in Regimine, et Administratione existens, monitioni, et mandato nostris, quoad præmissa, vel aliquid eorum obtemperare noluerit, etiam depósito Regimine, et Administratione hujusmodi, nisi paruerit, eisdem Censuris, et Pœnis subjicere decernimus.*

Publicari Mandat hanc Const. in Locis hic Expressis. Sed hæc forma immutata est, ut hic in fine.

Sect. 20. *Et ne* Henricus, *Ejusque Complices, et Fautores, Adhærentes, Consultores, et Sequaces, aliique quos præmissa Concernunt, Ignorantiam eorundem Præsentium Literarum, et in eis Contento-*

rum

rum prætendere valeant, Literas ipſas (in quibus Omnes et ſingulos, tam juris, quam facti, etiam ſolemnitatum, et Proceſſuum, Citationúmque Omiſſarum defectus, etiamſi Tales ſint, de quibus Specialis, et expreſſa mentio facienda eſſet, propter Notorietatem facti, Auctoritate, Scientia, et Poteſtatis plenitudine ſimilibus, ſupplemus) in Baſilicæ *Principis Apoſtolorum, et Cancellariæ Apoſtolicæ de urbe, et in partibus in Collegiatæ Beatæ* Mariæ Brugen. Tornacen. *et Parochialis de* Dunkercæ, *Oppidorum Morienſis Diœceſis, Eccleſiarum valvis Affigi, et Publicari Mandamus, decernentes quod earundem Literarum Publicatio ſic facta,* Henricum *Regem, Ejúſque Complices, Fautores, Adhærentes, Conſultores et Sequaces Omneſque alios, et ſingulos, quos Literæ Ipſæ quomodolibet Concernunt, perinde eos arctent, ac ſi Literæ Ipſæ eis Perſonaliter Lectæ, et Intimatæ fuiſſent, cum non ſit veriſimile, quod ea, quæ tam patenter fiunt, debeant apud eos incognita remanere.*

Sect. 21. *Ceterum quia difficile foret Præſentes Literas ad ſingula quæque Loca, ad quæ neceſſarium eſſet deferri, volumus, et dictâ Auctoritate decernimus, quod earum tranſumptis manu publici Notarij Confectis, vel in Almâ Urbe Impreſſis, ac Sigillo alicujus Perſonæ in Dignitate Eccleſiaſtica Conſtitutæ munitis, ubíque eadem fides adhibeatur quæ Originalibus adhiberetur ſi eſſent exhibitæ vel oſtenſæ.*

Tranſumptis credi jubet.

Sect.

Sanctionem pœnalem Imponit.

Sect. 22. *Nulli ergo Omnino hominum liceat hanc paginam Noſtræ Monitionis, Aggravationes, Reaggravationis, Declarationis, Percuſſionis, Suppoſitionis, Inhabilitationis, Abſolutionis, Liberationis, Requiſitionis, Inhibitionis, Hortationis, Exceptionis, Prohibitionis, Conceſſionis Extenſionis, Suppletionis, Mandatorum, Voluntatis, et Decretorum Infringere, vel ei auſu Temerario contraire. Si quis autem hoc attentare Præſumpſerit, Indignationem Omnipotentis Dei, ac Beatorum* Petri, *et* Pauli *Apoſtolorum ejus ſe noverit Incurſurum.*

D. P. An. 1. Die 30. Aug.

Dat. Romæ apud S. Marcum, Anno Incarnationis Dom. 1435. 3. Kal. Septemb. Pont. Noſtri Anno Primo.

FINIS.

A SHORT ACCOUNT OF THE CONTENTS OF THIS BOOK.

I.

THE Bull of Pope Pius *the Fifth* (*containing the Damnation and Excommunication of Queen* Elizabeth) *in Latin and Engliſh.* P. 1.

II.

The firſt Obſervation, That Pius V. *was neither the firſt nor laſt Pope, who Excommunicated and damn'd Kings and Emperors. For,* 1. *before him Pope* Conſtantine, Gregory *the Second,* Greg. *the Third,* Greg. *the Seventh,*

Gregory *the Ninth*, Innocent *the Fourth*, Paul *the Third*, &c. *did the same thing: And* 2. Gregory *the Thirteenth, and* Sixtus *the Fifth, after him.* p. 7.

III.

The second Observation, concerning the Ἐπιγραφὴ *or Title prefix'd to* Pius *the Fifth his Bull; that it is* Damnatio & Excommunicatio Elizabethæ. *Where it is proved,* 1. *That not only* Pius *the Fifth, but other Popes (not short of him in time or impiety) use the same hard word* (Damnation) *in the Titles prefix'd to their damnatory Bulls, wherein they Excommunicate Kings and Emperors.* 2. *The uncharitable Error, and Invalidity of their reasons they do, or can pretend for doing so.* p. 15.

IV.

The third Observation, wherein, 1. *The notion and significations of the word Damnation are explain'd.* 2. *That by the word Damnation in their Anathema's and Damnatory Bulls, not only some temporal loss or punishment (as to their Bodies or Estates) but eternal Damnation of Body and Soul, is meant, by the Pope and his Party; together with the invalidity of their reasons and pretences to justifie them in this particular.* p. 20.

V.

The fourth Observation, wherein we have, 1. *The grounds on which* Pius *the Fifth, and other Popes, build their Power to Excommunicate and Depose Kings; and that*

that in the Supremacy and Plenitude of Power, which (they pretend) our bleſſed Saviour gave to Peter, *and in him to all his Succeſſors. So that* Peter (*and ſo every Succeſſor of his*) *was* conſtituted a Prince over all Nations and Kingdoms, to pull up, and throw down, to diſſipate and deſtroy, to plant and build, &c. 2. *That ſuch Power was* (*by our bleſſed Saviour*) *given to* Peter *and his Succeſſors, they indeavour to prove out of Scripture,* (*and in their Bulls, cite the places*) Gen. 1. 16. *and* Jer. 1. 10. 3. *The ridiculous inconſequence and impertinence of ſuch Papal reaſoning, which ſhews them rather to be Fools, then Infallible.* p. 26.

VI.

The fifth Obſervation, againſt the Pope's pretended Supremacy. 1. *That* Peter's *Supremacy* (*much leſs the Popes*) *cannot be proved from* Matth. 10. 2. *where he is called* πρῶτος, primus (*or as in the Latin Fathers*) Princeps Apoſtolorum. 2. *Nor from that place,* Matth. 16. 18. 19. 3. *That St.* Paul *in Scripture, hath a far better pretence to the Supremacy and the Biſhoprick of* Rome, *then St.* Peter; *and yet neither he, nor any for him, ever pretended to any Papal Supremacy.* 4. *How our bleſſed Saviour and the Apoſtles* (*yet* Peter *no more then the reſt*) *are in Scripture, ſaid to be Foundations of the Church.* 5. *That the Power of the Keys was given to every Apoſtle, as well and as much as to* Peter. *Nay,* 6. *To every Biſhop and Prieſt, as is expreſly affirm'd in the Authentick Offices of the Roman Church, and in their* Trent *Council and Catechiſm.* 7. *That every Apoſtle was Chriſt's Vicar as well as* Peter; *that the Jeſuites pro-*

fess, (and in their Institutions do publish it) that their Superiors are Christ's Vicars. 8. *That* Pasce Oves, Joh. 21. 15. 16. 17. *(though usually) is most impertinently urged to prove* Peter's *Supremacy.* 9. *That the* 28. *Canon of the Council of* Chalcedon *(which utterly overthrows the Popes Supremacy) is basely corrupted by* Gratian *and the Canonists, and (that it might not appear) left out of their old Editions of the Councils.* p. 36. 37. &c.

VII.

The sixth Observation, In which a further examination and confutation of the Popish pretended grounds for the Popes Supremacy. That they neither do, nor can prove that Peter *ever had any such Monarchical Supremacy over the Apostles and all Christians, with the reasons why they cannot.* 2 *If it were granted (which is evidently untrue) that he had such a Power, yet it neither does, nor can appear (by Scripture, or any just Medium) that it was hereditary, and to pass to his Successor, but might be personal, and (as his Apostleship did) dye with him.* 3. *And if it were granted (which neither is, nor ever can be proved) that that Power was hereditary, and to be transferr'd to his Successor, yet they neither have, nor can have any just grounds to prove, that the Bishop of* Rome *is that Successor, and not the Bishop of* Antioch, *where (they say)* St. Peter *first sate.* 4. *That 'tis certain from Scripture, that* Peter *neither was nor could be (as they pretend) 25. years Bishop of* Rome. 5. *Nor can it (by Scripture) appear that ever he was at* Rome, *nor can* Rome *be meant by* Babylon, 1. Pet. 5. 13. 6. *Nor can it appear by any just Testimonies of Antiquity, that ever he*

he was at Rome. Papias *is the ground and Author on whom they rely for that Fable; and he an ignorant Person, and Arch-Heretick.* 7. *That to get credit to* Papias, *they have impiously corrupted* Eusebius. 8. *If it were granted, that he was at* Rome, *yet they have no ground or probability for it, that he was Bishop there; seeing there are far greater probabilities grounded on Scripture, that* Paul *was Bishop there, than* Peter (*or any for him*) *can pretend to; and yet they do not say, nor* (*without contradiction to their own Principles*) *can say, that he was Bishop there.* 9. *That those other honorary Titles or Epithites, which their Authors every where use as proper to the Pope, and marks of his Supremacy, or* (*at least*) *superiority over all Bishops* (*such as* Apostolicus Pontifex Summus, Papa, Sedes Apostolica, Vicarius Christi, Cathedra Apostolica, Successor Petri, &c.) *are impertinently made use of, without any proof or probability.* p. 91. 92. &c.

VIII.

The seventh Observation, concerning the Censures, Punishments and Curses contain'd in this Bull; and the Antichristian impiety of them. 1. *He miscalls the Queen,* an Heretick, a favourer of Hereticks, a Slave of Impiety, and then Anathematizes her, and cuts her off from the Unity of Christ's Body. 2. He deposes and deprives her of her pretended Right to the Crown, and of all manner of Dignity, Dominion and Priviledge. 3. He absolves her Subjects, and all others, who are bound to her by any Oath, from all their Oaths, and all debt of Fidelity and Obedience, and that for ever. 4. *He severely prohibits them all*

all, to obey any of her Laws or Commands. 5. *If any of them do otherwiſe, he Excommunicates and Curſes them, whether they be Papiſts or Proteſtants.* p.145.146.&c.

IX.

The eighth Obſervation, That the Pope is the great Antichriſt, the Man of Sin, and Son of Perdition, ſpoken of 2. Theſſ.3.4. *That the Opinons of* H. Grotius, (*that* Caius Caligula) *and of Dr.* Hammond, (*that* Simon Magus *was Antichriſt*) *are inconſiſtent and contradictory to each other, and to themſelves. That they are* (*both of them*) *repugnant to Scripture, the Judgment of the primitive Fathers, of Proteſtants and Papiſts, and the ſenſe of Chriſtendom for about* 1600. *years after our bleſſed Saviour,* &c.p.151.152.&c.ad p.199.

X.

The ninth Obſervation, What the Popes Power is, (*and whence they pretend to have it*) *which inables them with Authority to ſit Judges, and paſs damnatory Sentences againſt Supream Princes, for Hereſie.* 2. *What that Hereſie is, and who the Hereticks, who by the Pope are ſo ſeverely damn'd.* 3. *What thoſe puniſhments are, which they pretend they may, and* (*when and where they can*) *actually do inflict on ſuch Hereticks.* 4. *Of the* Waldenſes, *that* (*by the teſtimony of their Enemies*) 1. *They had continued ever ſince the Apoſtles time.* 2. *That there was ſcarce any Chriſtian Country in which they were not.* 3. *That they lived juſtly before men, and believ'd all things well of God, and all the Articles of the Creed: but*

but their fault was, They said Rome was Babylon, and the Pope Antichrist,&c. p.199.200.&c.

XI.

Observation the Tenth, That Queen Elizabeth *stood Excommunicate, before the Damnatory Bull of* Pius *the Fifth, and by whom,&c.* p.213.

XII.

Observation the Eleventh, Of the damnable and pernicious Doctrines and Conclusions, which evidently follow, upon their approv'd and practised Principles, of Deposing and Anathematizing Kings and Supream Princes. That 'tis neither Treason, Murder, or any Sin, for Subjects to Assassinate their King, if he be Excommunicate by the Pope. Nay, that it is a meritorious Act, for which they promise them vast rewards here, and an higher degree of glory in Heaven hereafter,&c. p.219.220. &c.

XIII.

The Damnation and Excommunication of Henry *the Eighth by Pope* Paul *the Third,* Decemb.17.Anno 1538.

FINIS.